en'l Library
Techny
ot. Hist. Eccl.
. A. No. 6...

The Catholic
Theological Union
LIBRARY
Chicago, Ill.

THE GENTILE AND THE JEW

The Catholic
Theological Union
LIBRARY
Chicago, Ill.

THE GENTILE AND THE JEW

IN THE COURTS OF THE TEMPLE OF CHRIST

An Introduction to the History of Christianity

WITHDRAWN

FROM THE GERMAN OF

JOHN J. I. DÖLLINGER, D.D., D.C.L.
PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MUNICH

BY

N. DARNELL, M.A.
LATE FELLOW OF NEW COLLEGE, OXFORD

FATHERS' LIBRARY SD TECHNY, ILL.

SECOND EDITION

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I

TECHNY ILLINOIS SOCIETATIS VERBI DIVINI

LONDON
GIBBINGS & COMPANY
18 BURY STREET, W.C.
1906

23 | 7485

First Edition, Longman, 1862

PREFACE OF THE AUTHOR

THIS work is, I believe, the first attempt that has been made to represent the Paganism of the period previous to our Lord, with at least an effort at completeness, the sketch embracing the heathen religious system, heathen modes of thought and speculation, heathen philosophy, life, and manners, so far as they were severally connected with the religion, were determined by it, and reacted upon it in their turn.

The title of my work indicates the point of view from which the sketch is taken. The history of Christianity necessarily presumes, for the bare understanding of it, an acquaintance with the history of the Pagan and the Jew. The questions, — what soil did Christianity find to build on? to what doctrines and systems of thought could it attach itself? what circumstances paved the way for it, and forwarded and facilitated its expansion? what obstacles, prejudices, and errors had it to overcome? what adversaries to encounter? what evils to remedy? how did Paganism react on Christianity?— all these questions, on the importance of which it were superfluous to waste a word here, admit, as it appears to me, of a satisfactory solution only through an exposition, penetrating as deeply beneath the surface, and of as wide a horizon, as the present.

Here, then, are the circumstances preassigning its limits to the work before us, whether chronological or geographical. In the latter point of view, the Paganism

of Eastern Asia, Brahmanism and Buddhism, were obviously excluded; for both, after many centuries, still stand so completely aloof from the Christian Church, as to put out of question all contact that might have left behind any trace on the side of Christianity. As regards time, it seemed not only to the purpose, but even imperative for the due fulfilment of my task, not to stop short at the period of Augustus and of the Founder of the Christian religion, but to continue the picture of Græco-Roman Paganism down to the time of the Antonines, or 150–160 A.D. Up to that date, it progressed in course of development, unimpeded by pressure from without; only from the middle of the second century after Christ were Christian influences observable upon it. After that date, the Græco-Pagan soil produced but one intellectual fruit of importance, the doctrine of Plotinus, with its developments and modifications by the later Neo-Platonists. This school and its teaching are, however, no real product of heathenism pure; Christianity exercised no inconsiderable influence on its development in its religious aspect. The phenomenon of Neo-Platonism generally is only to be grasped through the medium of antagonism to Christianity. This fact I allude to here simply because it helps to prove my assertion that the internal history of old heathendom, up to the commencement of the process of its dissolution, really came to a close at the epoch mentioned.

If I be not mistaken, there is in the agitation of the Pagan intellect throughout the century before, and the century and a half after, Christ, amid much that seems accidental, a certain regularity discernible, an entering of that spirit into forms of ever-progressive precision. The genius of antiquity essayed, exhausted, and used up, so to say, every combination possible of the principles once intrusted and handed down to her, the entire of the plastic power that dwelt within her. It was only

after she had become completely incorporated, after each one of her doctrines, forms, and institutions, her sum of vital power, had been sifted and consumed, that with the period of the Antonines a mighty revolution commenced, not visible, indeed, to those who were contemporary with it, suspected by but a few; and a leaf in the history of the human mind was turned over.

This is one of the impressions presented to my mind's eye with a peculiar brightness and life, as a result of my inquiry; a conviction which I trust the reader will share with me, if I have not fallen utterly short of the height of my task, and below its requirements.

J. DÖLLINGER.

MUNICH, *6th April* 1857.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I

BOOK I

GENERAL VIEW. STATE OF THE WORLD

I. The Roman Empire

	PAGE
Extent and census of the Roman Empire	3
Octavian sole ruler	4
Splendour and population of the city of Rome	5
Administration and state of the provinces in general	7
Depopulation and desolate condition of Greece	8
State of Italy	9
„ Sicily	11
„ Sardinia	11
„ Corsica	11
Provinces of Asia Minor, the Western	12
„ „ the Northern	12
„ Asia Anterior. Greek spirit	14
„ „ Lycia	15
„ „ Phrygia	15
„ „ Galatia	16
„ „ Pisidia	16
„ „ Isauria	16
„ „ Cilicia	16
The Greek islands	17
Egypt, character of the country and people	18
Syria, Hellenic	20
Phœnicia also Hellenised	22
Palestine	22
„ Judæa, résumé of its history	23
Northern Africa	25
Spain, character of the people	27
„ division of	28
„ cities of	28
Gaul, conquest of	29

PAGE

Gaul, population of, and its character 29
„ Romanising of 31
„ division of 32
Germany, Upper and Lower 35
Conquest and inhabitants of Britain 36
„ „ Rhætia 37
„ „ Noricum 38
„ „ Pannonia 38
„ „ Illyria 39
„ „ Macedonia 39
„ „ Thracia 40
„ „ Mœsia 41
„ „ Dacia 41
Romanising of the different people 42
Spread of Greek and Roman tongues 43

II. The People and Countries not included in the Roman Empire

Armenia 45
The Parthian Empire 46
Assyria 47
Mesopotamia 48
Babylonia 49
Arabia 50
Æthiopia 51
India 52
„ Rise and fall of empires in 52
„ System of castes 54
China 59
„ Character of empire and people 59
„ The doctrine of Confucius 60
Germany, extent of 62
German tribes 63
„ confederations 63
Mode of life among the Germans 65
Sarmatians 66
Slave, Finnish, and Lithuanian races 67

BOOK II

RELIGIONS: THE HELLENIC RELIGION

I. The Origin of Greek Polytheism

Polytheism due to the deification of nature 68
Pelasgic deities 72

PAGE
Fetichism 72
Two primitive deities 73

II. The Gods, Demons, and Heroes of the Hellenes

Origin of the Greek system of gods 77
The twelve Olympic deities 81
Zeus 81
Hera 83
Poseidon 84
Pallas Athene 85
Apollo 86
Artemis 89
Hermes 91
Hestia 92
Ares 93
Aphrodite, Ourania 93
„ Pandemos 95
Hephæstos 96
Demeter 96
Pluto 98
Dionysos 98
Inferior deities 102
Demons 108
Heroes 110
Heracles the national hero 113
Multitude of objects worshipped 116
Confusion of worship 116
Geographical survey of the different worships . . . 120

BOOK III

THE MYSTERIES AND THE ORPHIC RELIGIOUS DOCTRINE

Contents of the mysteries 131
Gods of the mysteries 135
Opinions as to the value of the mysteries 136
Orpheus first originator of the mysteries 145
Traditions of the death of Orpheus 146
Orphic worship of Dionysos 147
The Orpheus of Æschylus 149
Relation of the Orphic Dionysos Zagreus with Attys and Osiris . 153
Osiris-Zagreus 155
Orphic mystery school 156
Connection of the mysteries with the cultus of Dionysos . . 161

PAGE
The Orpheotelestai and their consecration 165
The Phrygian cultus an element of the mysteries . . . 166
The Samothracian mysteries, the Cabiri, and their gods . . 172
Lemnian and other mysteries 180
The Eleusinian mysteries 186
„ Iacchos or Dionysos, their chief god . . 190
Order of and proceedings in the Eleusinian mystery rite . . 193
Demeter and her daughter, the centres of the Eleusinian mystery action 195
Symbols and formulæ 199
Admission to initiation, and exclusion from 202
Attraction of the mysteries 207
Hopes of bliss held out in them 208
Various effects and impressions of the mysteries . . . 209
The Thesmophoria, dedicated to Demeter and Themis . . 211

BOOK IV

PRIESTHOOD—DIVINATION—ORACLES—SACRIFICE AND PRAYERS—FESTIVALS—TEMPLES AND IMAGES—WORSHIP OF HOUSE-GODS

I. Priesthood and Divination

Office and powers of the Greek priests 214
Vast number of officials 217
Different methods of soothsaying 218

II. Oracles

Necessity of oracles for the Greeks 220
Oracle at Delphi 221
The other oracles 225
Causes of their decay 229

III. Religious Purifications

The notion of purity a physical one 231
Modes of purification 232

IV. Prayers

Their character theurgic and not moral 234
Their object external goods 236
Attitude in worship 237

V. Sacrifices

PAGE
Meaning of the bloody sacrifice 238
„ human sacrifice 239
Later modifications or abolition of human sacrifice . . . 241
Animals and kinds of sacrifice 242
Rite and banquet of sacrifice 245

VI. Festivals

Religious character of the Greek festivals 248
The great national festivals 249

VII. Temples and Images

Designation and use of the temples 252
Images of the gods; their form 253
„ „ principle of their invocation . . . 254
House idols 255

VIII. Transgressions against Religion, and their Punishment

Many religious crimes punished with death 256
Prosecutions for impiety 258

BOOK V

GREEK PHILOSOPHY, AND ITS INFLUENCE ON THE RELIGIOUS SENSE AND CONDUCT OF THE PEOPLE. DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGIOUS IDEAS AMONG THE GREEKS FROM THE SIXTH CENTURY BEFORE CHRIST

I. Up to Alexander the Great

Rise of philosophy out of the cosmogonies 260
The Ionic school 263
Heraclitus and his school 264
Pythagoras 266
The Pythagoreans 267
„ their leading doctrine of the migration of the soul 271
The Eleatic school, its teaching pantheistic 272
Pantheistic system of Empedocles 275
The Atomic school 279
The Sophists, their rhetorico-sceptical bias 283

PAGE

The Sophists, censure of Plato 284
Materialism and Atheism 285
Socrates, his personal appearance and vocation . . . 287
„ his ethics 288
„ views of God and the soul 290
„ his holding with the popular religion . . . 291
„ his impeachment and death 292

DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGIOUS CIVILISATION AMONG THE GREEKS UP TO THE DEATH OF SOCRATES—RELIGIOUS ASPECT OF THE LEADERS OF GREEK LITERATURE—SOME OF THEIR MORE IMPORTANT RELIGIOUS IDEAS AND DOCTRINES

Allegorical interpretation of gods and myths . . . 296
Immoral effect of myths 297
Popular belief in myths 299
Pindar 299
Herodotus in a religious point of view 300
Thucydides 300
Epicharmus 301
Aristophanes ridicules the gods 302
Religion and gods in the dramas of Euripides . . . 303
Sophocles, his religiousness 305
Greek notions of the jealousy of the gods 306
„ destiny 307
„ evil 309
„ the comfortlessness of life 310
„ the fall 311
Saga of Prometheus 312
Views of the state after death 316

THE SOCRATICS—PLATO AND HIS FOLLOWERS

Cyrenaic school 320
Cynic school 322
Megarian school 323
Plato, his universal intellect 323
„ his doctrine concerning God and ideas . . . 325
„ „ the creation of the world . . 327
„ „ the world-soul . . . 328
„ „ the star-gods . . . 330
„ anthropology 331
„ psychology 332
„ proofs of immortality 336
„ migration of souls 337
„ matter the seat of evil 339

PAGE

Plato, his doctrine concerning virtue 340
„ his ideal republic 341
„ his relation to religion 343
„ relation of his teaching to Christianity . . . 347
„ his scholars ; the Academy 349

ARISTOTLE

His opposition to Plato 351
„ teaching about God, and his relation to the world . . 352
„ view of the stars a link between his teaching and the popular religion 356
„ psychology 357
„ ethics 359

II. PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION AMONG THE GREEKS FROM THE TIME OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT TO THE FIRST CENTURY AFTER CHRIST

Fusion of East and West 360
Blending of religious worships 361
Apotheosis of the living and the dead 363
Hostility between philosophy and religion 365
Materialism, and decline of philosophy 367

STOICISM

Zeno, and his relation to the Cynics 368
The Stoic view of the world materialistic 368
Determinism 371
Position in regard to popular religion 374
Paiderastia 377
Suicide among the Stoics 378

THE EPICUREAN SYSTEM

Epicurus and his "canonic" or doctrine of thought . . 379
Atomistic cosmology of Epicurus 379
Materialistic psychology 381
Ethics : groundwork in freedom of the will 383
His doctrine of pleasure and repose of soul 384

SCEPTICISM

Happiness its starting-point and aim 386
A production and a symptom of the times 387
Carneades and his antitheistic dialectics 388
Materialism in the ascendant under Stoic influence . . . 390
Decline and impotence of philosophy 392

BOOK VI

THE RELIGIONS IN ANTERIOR AND MIDDLE ASIA AND IN AFRICA

I. Asia Minor

	PAGE
Various worships in Caria and Phrygia	396
Orgiastic cultus of Cybele, and its accompaniments	397
Rites in Cappadocia and Pontus: Worships of moon and fire	399

II. Persia and the other Irânian Countries

Zoroaster and the *Zendavesta*	403
„ distinct from Zaratus	404
Mixture of Cushite magism and Arian dualism in Media	406
Reaction in Persia against the Magians	407
Ormuzd and Ahriman	408
The doctrine of Zervan only a later addition	411
Good and evil spirits: Amschaspands, Izeds, and Ferwers	413
Worship of elements, particularly fire	415
The great world-year: Ahriman's struggle with Ormuzd	418
Man, his origin and destination	420
The Fall and Paradise	421
Prayers and sacrifice	423
The Homa as sacrifice and sacrament	424
The priesthood, the Athravas and the Magians	428
Morality	429
Marriage	430
Essence of purification	431
Treatment of corpses	432
State after death	433
Doctrine of resurrection	434
Mithras, the creed and mysteries of	437

III. Heathenism in Mesopotamia, Babylonia, and Assyria

The Chaldeans the dominant priestly race	446
Bel and Mylitta	447
Astrolatry	448

IV. Syria, Phœnicia, and Arabia

Syro-Phœnician cultus of Baal	451
Sacrifice of children	452
Astarte, and the worship of unchastity paid her	454
Debauchery and cruelty in the rites of the Syrian goddess	455
Elagabalus and Adonis	457
Heathenism at Carræ	459
Arabian worship of the gods	460

V. Egypt

1. System of Gods

PAGE
General character and development of the Egyptian system of gods 463
Sun-worship 465
Ammon, Kneph, and others 468
Myth of Isis and Osiris 471
Horus, or Har 474
Harpocrates 474
Thoth 475
Female deities 477
Typhon, the dark destroying principle 479

2. Worship of Animals

Origin of animal worship 482
Different species of sacred animals 484
The sacred bulls and their cultus 486

3. The Lower World, and Fate of Man after Death

Immortality and migration of souls connected . . . 488
The judgment of the dead, and bliss 489
Punishments beyond the grave 494

4. Festivals, Priesthood, and Sacrifice

Number and object of the different festivals 495
Festivals of Osiris 497
„ Isis 497
„ Pascht 498
The priesthood and its ordinances 499
Sacrifice of animals, how selected 503
Meaning of this sacrifice 503
Sullenness and exclusiveness of Egyptian character . . 506
Disciplina arcani among the priests 508
Threatening the gods 511
Phallus-worship 511

5. Fate and Course of Development of the Egyptian Religion

Introduction of strange deities 512
Influence of Persian supremacy 514
„ Greek supremacy 515
Deification of kings 516

VI. Carthage

Carthaginian worship, with sacrifice of children . . . 518

PART I

THE GENTILE

Books I. to VI.

Encore que les philosophes soient les protecteurs de l'erreur, toutefois ils ont rappé à la porte de la vérité (*Veritatis fores pulsant*, Tertullian). S'ils ne sont pas entrés dans son sanctuaire, s'ils non pas eu le bonheur de le voir et de l'adorer dans son temple, ils se sont quelquefois présentés à ses portiques, et lui ont rendu de loin quelque hommage.

Bossuet, *Panég. de Ste. Cathérine.*

BOOK I

I. THE ROMAN EMPIRE

TWENTY-ONE centuries had passed away since the great Deluge, the period at which the human race began to spread afresh over the earth, and the fairest portion of it, the countries, belonging to the three quarters of the globe, which encircle the Mediterranean Sea, were then united to one vast world-wide empire, the Roman. From the small beginnings of a community on the banks of the Tiber, this kingdom had grown up, long unheeded or despised by the rest of the world. At last, after seven hundred years of existence, it had won for itself by conquest that gigantic form, which now stretched from the Atlantic Ocean as far as the Euphrates, and from the northern shores of Gaul and the German Danube to Africa's sand deserts and the cataracts of the Nile, and embraced a population of nearly a hundred millions.

At this point the empire had reached the limits assigned to it by nature. Attempts to make new conquests halted nearly everywhere, in the face of physical difficulties almost impossible to surmount. On the south the great African desert set a boundary line to Roman domination; on the south-east, the Ethiopians and Arabians proved hard of access; and here, as well as on the north and north-east, the sacrifices presented themselves, which the conquest and maintenance of such countries would have entailed, with their desolated cities and a rural population, for the most part poverty-stricken,—sacrifices in no pro-

portion whatever to the advantages accruing. In the west, too, the island of Hibernia alone was left for conquest, and it could offer no very inviting prospect; while on the east, the Parthians, from the situation of their kingdom as well as from their style of warfare, so destructive to the Roman legions, were neighbours not assailable with impunity. Hence the principle already enunciated by Octavian: "Rome must not enlarge the borders of her empire." Accordingly, the greater number of his successors limited themselves to the maintenance of the existing state of things, and the conduct of merely defensive wars; and even went so far, either of their own free will or by compulsion, as to renounce conquests already made.

The Roman empire did not rest upon the strength, and distinctive national qualities, of a great people, but still, as at the outset, on the inhabitants of a single city, which ever and consistently claimed not only to form the seat of empire, but also to remain in entire and exclusive possession of the whole power of the state. Weary, however, of the long civil wars, of proscriptions and endless bloodshed, Rome still longed for security of property and of enjoyment, and was only able to realise it under the sway of a single chief. That one man was Octavian, who, after overcoming his last enemy and rival, Antony, seized the helm with a strong and temperate hand; and retaining, for the most part, the old-established republican forms and names, quietly guided the state into a new channel, and erected his throne upon republican principles.

Where the principate combined in itself, and for life, all the executive powers, the republic meanwhile could be but a phantom form, gradually dwindling off to the vanishing-point. As chief of a standing army of nearly three hundred and forty thousand men, for the support of his wars and his administration; as president of a senate without a will in opposition to his, and that had been degraded to a mere assessorial and functional authority; as censor, perpetual tribune, and head of the state religion; protected by a bodyguard devoted to him, whose prefect, as early as under Tiberius, became the second person in the realm,—the monarch was now possessed of an unlimited power: and the successor of Augustus had it already in

his hands to destroy or to exalt whatever still remained of republican form, without danger to himself.

People in Rome were kept in good humour by largesses of money and corn, by public spectacles in theatre and arena, by fights of gladiators and wild beasts. Amongst all ranks a disposition was evinced to manifest sheer cowardice and slavish selfishness towards the man in authority; and thus the principate developed with astonishing rapidity into a fearful despotism, which, fostered and egged on by women, freedmen, flatterers, spies, and informers, was soon to present its horrified eye-witnesses with the spectacle of such a series of abominations as wantonness, thirst of blood, and scorn of humanity could inspire into tyrants released from all restraint and shame.

The city of Rome, enriched and splendidly ornamented, as it had been in the last times of the republic, by rifled treasures of conquered lands, assumed an entirely new aspect under Augustus. The splendour of the Campus Martius, adorned by him with public buildings, far surpassed even the beauty of the old city of the Seven Hills; and with justice might that monarch pride himself on having found a city of brick, and left one of marble in its stead.[1] With each year, as it came, the city on the Tiber now developed more and more into a rendezvous for all the nations of the globe. Slaves, dragged together from every land, penetrated with their foreign manners into the interiors of families, and, with their strange views, into the spirit and modes of thought of the rising generation. Rome was also inundated with independent aliens. From three quarters of the world they pressed to the world's city, either to lead there a life of greater enjoyment and pleasure, or simply to procure a livelihood—perhaps to return again, with what they had there earned, to hearth and home. Greek and Syrian, inhabitants of Asia Minor and Egypt, sat themselves down in Rome as literati and philosophers, as ministers of luxury, debauchery, and impurity, or as priests of strange rites and propagators of superstition. Rome had become a Greek city in language and manners, and "the Syrian waters of the

[1] Sueton. *Aug.* xxviii.

Orontes streamed into the Tiber,"—so the poet afterwards complained in his picture of the manners of his day:[1] while, in a century and a half from Augustus, Athenæus could say, whole nations of the East had settled themselves in Rome.[2]

Thus Rome, since Augustus, maintained a population approaching, or perhaps equal to, that of the London of the present day, of a million and a half, possibly two millions. Nearly the half of these, however, were slaves; and of the freemen, by far the larger proportion were externs, who had been presented with the freedom of the state, or were freedmen and their descendants. Side by side with the enormous opulence of a small number of families, such poverty prevailed that Augustus, in his time, had been obliged to provide upwards of two hundred thousand of the inhabitants with money, corn, and bread. In spite of the care this monarch took to preserve the old pure citizen blood, the genuine Roman families, already sore diminished by civil wars and proscriptions, kept continually dying out. To this issue a radical evil of the day specially contributed, namely, a wide-spreading disinclination to the state of marriage, which had come to be felt an onerous restraint. In vain did Augustus endeavour, by the laws Papia and Julia-Poppæa, to check this prevailing state-sickness of celibacy amongst the well-to-do and richer classes. Even in wedlock childlessness became more and more frequent; and thus, by virtue of the second of these two enactments, the having three children brought with it important privileges.

Rome, therefore, inevitably became the city in which all the vices of different zones, all the defects and excrescences of human society, were gathered together and blended—the city in which a homeless population, roaming about in idleness, beggarly and yet habituated to all the requirements of luxury, were maintained out of the public revenues; and this was the plebs, forming the greater proportion of the free community.[3]

In the dependent countries too, while the imperial authority lasted, no right public spirit, no patriotric senti-

[1] Juvenal. iii. 60 sqq. [2] *Deipnosoph.* i. 36.
[3] Seneca, *Consol. ad Helvid.* vi.; Tacit. *Annal.* xiv. 20.

ment of a common bond of union could be awakened. The Gaul and the Syrian, the Egyptian and the Spaniard, were far too great strangers one to the other, and remained so; and yet the administration of the provinces was, on the whole, substantially better than it had been in the latter days of the republic. In those times, a Volesus Messala could, as proconsul of Asia, execute three thousand men in one day, and exclaim, in a rapture of self-admiration, as he passed through where the dead bodies lay, "What king had dared to do this deed?"[1] Provinces were then looked upon, and given up to plunder, as mere gold mines for Rome, as means of enrichment for the oft-changed proconsul thence despatched, as well as for every Roman who chose to betake himself thither in character of factor and farmer of the public revenues; but under Augustus, and after him, a more secure and more tolerable state of things arose. The governors of provinces were subjected to a stricter surveillance, had fixed salaries, and dared not arbitrarily increase the imposts on their subjects. Their superintendence of municipal administration was kindly towards the people. The distinction between the sovereign Roman commonalty and the dependent provincial disappeared, and the Roman tribunals of justice in all countries were superior to the earlier ones at home. Under Roman domination, there was an end of the perpetual family feuds and domestic factions which, in former times, had lacerated many countries. The tyranny of the Cæsars, whose memory is stigmatised in history, pressed heavily on the Roman aristocracy—not at all, or at least far more lightly, on the provinces.

The connection of the different portions of the vast empire with one another, and with the centre of power, was now established on a magnificent footing. The means and ways of communication were multiplied; a network of excellently constructed military roads and highways gradually spread over the whole empire, and the government postal service, already set on foot by the first Cæsar, was extended to all the provinces.

The result of the change to the monarchical system

[1] Seneca, *de Irâ*, ii. 5.

was, therefore, decidedly beneficial to far the greater portion of subjects, whether races or individuals, united together under the Roman sceptre. Many countries—Gaul, for instance, Spain, Africa, even Egypt and Syria—attained to a greater security of property and rights, took part in the community of intellectual life and intercourse, which resulted from the connection of the three quarters of the world lying round the Mediterranean Sea, and contrasted advantageously their present flourishing condition with their earlier one, before their incorporation into the Roman empire.

In the central countries of the empire, however, and of the old world generally, there already might be discovered symptoms of a suspicious depopulation and desolation, sure forerunners of the breaking to pieces of the then system. By this time the history of the old Hellenes was played out to the end, like a great passion-stirring drama, that at the close is only pitiful. The Macedonian, and after them the Roman, wars had filled that fair land with ruins. Old cities of renown had disappeared, or were only partially inhabited, or, like Thebes and Megalopolis, had sunk into villages. Many islands, once well inhabited, were now solitary rocks. The races of Æta were almost annihilated. Acarnania and Ætolia were converted into wastes; the cities of Thessaly decayed, and the land impoverished. The neighbouring Epirus could not recover itself from the shock it had received through Paulus Æmilius; its cities were demolished; only a small remnant of its former population dwelt in thinly scattered villages. Of the twelve cities of Achaia, five were destroyed or deserted; Arcadia and Messenia hardly boasted an inhabitant. In Laconia, once rich in cities, one hardly counted now thirty villages. Later on, Plutarch thought the whole of Greece might, with an effort, perhaps bring into the field three thousand hoplites. Athens, it is true, looked still a beautiful city; but the old families were exterminated there, the last blow they received being in the blood shed by Sylla. A gathering of foreign settlers now filled the city.[1] The Roman colonies, Patræ, Corinth, and Nicopolis, on the promontory of Actium, were meant as rallying-points for Roman authority, as well as

[1] Tac. *Annal.* ii. 55.

for the revivification of the desolated country. Corinth, favoured by its position between two seas, soon became again a flourishing commercial city, and with its prosperity came hand in hand the old luxury. But on the whole, the pressure of fiscal authority, which was a continual burden on Greece during the time of the Cæsars, proved a constant counter-agent to national prosperity, and checked the returning tide of population. Hellas remained a thinly inhabited land, exhibiting more graves than living men, more ruins than cities, and the Hellenes were a people sapped at the very heart's core.

The immunity from taxes, granted by Nero to the Greeks, was again withdrawn under Vespasian; but the existence of free cities with municipal privileges, local courts of justice, and provincial councils, the enduring validity of many Greek laws and regulations, and, besides, the official character, which the Greek tongue remained in possession of,—all this afforded the descendants of the old Hellenes, who had undergone the admixture of foreign blood, the appearance and consolation of national independence. They saw the Amphictyons still assemble, the Areopagus still judging in Athens, in accordance with the old custom, and deputies from the Achæan, Phocian, and Bœotian leagues meeting for deliberation on affairs. Addicted as they were to the cultus of the past, despisers of everything that was foreign, and admirers of their own productions only, what wonder that they should be even yet disposed to keep up the old presumptuous division of mankind into Greeks and barbarians? True it is notwithstanding, that each swarm of Hellenes, whom the lust of gain drove Romewards, was mostly received there with cold neglect, and as hungry adventurers was classed together with the new arrivals from Egypt and the various countries of Asia, who spoke the Greek tongue.[1]

On the score of prosperity and population, Italy herself had come off worst from the pressure, the clogging and destructive influence of Rome. Already, before the beginning of the civil wars, whole races in Middle and South Italy had been rooted out. In the ten years from 90 till 80 B.C., the Peninsula suffered a new and

[1] Juvenal. *Sat.* iii. 76.

almost incalculable loss of her best population. The Italian war against Rome swept away more than three hundred thousand young men.[1] Little was left of the Samnite and Etrurian people. The Sabine, Etruscan, and Venetian tongues had disappeared, or were on the point of becoming extinct. The aboriginal peasantry of Italy was, as it were, exterminated, and villanously replaced by slaves, who cultivated the broad demesnes (*latifundia*) of their masters. Most ruinous was the operation of the military colonies, started by Octavian, chiefly as settlements for his thirty-four legions, and accompanied as it was with the expulsion of the quondam occupants of the soil. It was cast in his teeth that he had given up nearly the whole of Italy as a prize to his veterans.[2] The mass of these military settlers had neither inclination nor capacity for a regular, well-ordered family life, and died speedily out.[3] They could not compensate for those sixty-three cities, which, from the dictatorship of Cæsar to the first year of Augustus, had lost their population; or, robbed of their territorial possessions, had fallen into an inevitable decay. Besides, in one year, Augustus had sent one hundred and twenty thousand colonists from Italy into the provinces,[4] and at the same time, there was a perpetual, half-spontaneous, half-compulsory immigration of people, either into Rome, or the last embodied portion of the empire: into Rome, to procure a livelihood for themselves at the expense of the state, as partakers in the distribution of the corn largess; into the provinces, to lay hands on a lucrative office, or to find an opening into one of the numerous Roman trading companies. Italian merchants were settled in all cities, from Arabia, on the one hand, to the Marcomanni and Cherusci,[5] on the other. In the gradual and ever-increasing exhaustion of Italy lay the chief cause of the subsequent decay of the whole empire.

Nevertheless, Northern Italy was favourably distinguished from Middle and South. There Padua, Verona, Ravenna, Milan, Aquileia, were or became all of them

[1] Vell. Pat. ii. 15.
[2] Appian, *Bell. Civ.* v. 12 sqq. p. 728, Schweig.; Suet. *Aug.* xiii.
[3] Tacit. *Ann.* xiv. 27.
[4] *Monum. Ancyran.*
[5] Dio Cass. lxxi. 1187; Tacit. *Ann.* ii. 62.

flourishing cities, as seats of Roman colonists. On the other hand, the old splendour of Magna Græcia had vanished;[1] only Rhegium, Brundusium, Beneventum, and Tarentum, now shrunk into the half of its former circuit, still preserved a kind of life. "If any one wants to see wastes," says Seneca,[2] "let him go into Lucania and Bruttium." Meanwhile, Campania, and particularly the Bay of Naples, that earthly paradise, whose beauty even the rich Romans knew how to appreciate, remained in full bloom. Here was Naples, with her manners, art, and science, all Greek, a favourite retreat of well-educated Romans; here Baiæ displayed her charming villas; and here too Puteoli formed an emporium for Alexandrian and Spanish merchandise.

In the three-tongued Sicily, with its old Sicilian, or Celtic, country population, its Grecian cities and Roman colonists, the Greek character and civilisation still preponderated.[3] Still the cities of this fairest and most fertile island of the Mediterranean could never recover themselves again. On the whole of the line of coast looking towards Africa, the cities, as far as Agrigentum, had already gone to ruin in the Carthaginian wars.[4] In the interior, slave wars and the freebooting habits of the pastoral people had wrought grievous desolation. Himera, Selinus, and Gela, Naxos too, with Eubœa and Callipolis on the east coast, had all disappeared; Enna was well-nigh deserted; Tauromenium, hardly dealt with by Octavian, had fallen into decay. Syracuse had her prosperity interrupted by the conquest of Marcellus, and it was in vain that Augustus tried to revive it by a colony. The prospect was fairer with Catana, Panormus, Segesta, and Lilybæum; on the whole, through the quiet and order established under the Cæsars, the island attained again to considerable prosperity, as the granary of Rome and Italy.

The islands of Sardinia and Corsica, united into one province, contained a very mixed population. There Tyrrhenian Iolai, and immigrant Corsi and Belari (refugees), formed the basis of a population reputed as slothful and evil-

[1] Cic. *de Amic.* iv.
[2] *De Tranq. Animi*, ii.
[3] "Siculi trilingues," Apul. *Metam.* xi. p. 259, ed. Elmenh.
[4] Strabo, vi. p. 272 (pp. 392, 393, Oxf.).

disposed; and to these are to be added Phenician and Carthaginian colonists besides. The land was considered unhealthy, and on that account was selected as a place of banishment for condemned criminals; yet, on the score of its fertility, it was the second corn granary for Rome, after Sicily. The population of rocky and thinly inhabited Corsica was composed of a medley of Tyrrhenian, Ligurian, and Roman colonists. In Strabo's time, the Corsicans appear still as rude barbarians, entirely devoted to the breeding of cattle. Notwithstanding, one might have counted not less than thirty-three towns in the island under the Roman sovereignty.

In the peninsula of Asia Minor, the river Halys served to divide the languages and the countries. The nations living to the west of it, Lydians, Carians, Mysians, and Bithynians, belonged in general to the common stock of Thracians in Europe. With them the Greek language was the prevalent one; the old native dialect in parts, as, for instance, among the Lydians, having been lost without leaving a trace behind.[1] Eastward of the Halys lived the people of Syro-Arabic descent, Cappadocians, Cilicians, Pamphylians, and Solymi, *i.e.* the old inhabitants of Lycia and Pisidia, although the Lycians had received so strong an admixture of Greek blood that they passed for a Greek people.

The northern portion of Asia Minor, extending to the Black Sea, formed the countries of Bithynia, Paphlagonia, and Pontus. Bithynia, also in earlier times denominated Asiatic Thrace, one of the most fertile of countries, was inhabited by some tribes of Thracians who had immigrated thither, and by the remnant of an earlier Mysian population. Its capital, Nicomedia, now grown to a great size, had become one of the finest and largest cities of the old world. Cius, Chalcedon, Nicæa, and Heraclea, mostly with Hellenic colonists, diffused their Greek civilisation through the country.

The Paphlagonians were an entirely different people in language and customs from their Thracian neighbours on the west, and their Celtic to the south. They came of Syrian stock, and were reputed particularly superstitious,

[1] Strabo, pp. 565–631 (pp. 817–905, Oxf.).

even amongst the heathens. The interior of their rough mountainous district was poor in towns, and but little known: only Gangra, situated near the borders of Galatia, which in Strabo's time was but a small town, became considerable at a later period, and the capital of the province. There were Hellenic settlers, however, on the seacoast; and Sinope, a Milesian colony, early became a rich and important seat of commerce, and was still a large and beautiful city.

Extending along the shores of the Black Sea, to the north-east lay Pontus, inhabited by many small heterogeneous tribes, with Greek commercial cities on its coast; and since the death of King Polemo the Second, under Nero, a tributary province of Rome. On the east, it reached as far as Colchis and Greater Armenia. A variety of tongues, it appears, were spoken in the interior. Cities here were only of importance and famous in regard of their religious worship; Comana Pontica, for instance, and Cabira; Neo-Cæsarea, afterwards the large and beautiful capital of the district, had begun to flourish from the year 64.

To the south of Galatia and Pontus was Cappadocia, constituting, with lesser Armenia, one of the largest provinces of the Roman empire. It comprised nearly a third of the whole peninsula. The land was, for the most part, rough and unfruitful: its inhabitants were of Syrian origin, and styled white Syrians by the Persians, to distinguish them from the darker coloured inhabitants of Syria. Cities were here first founded under the Romans, chiefly through the establishment of Roman colonies, in lieu of the fortresses and open towns that had hitherto existed. It was thus that the capital Cæsarea gradually rose, besides Tyana and Comana. Lesser Armenia and Melitene, first formed under Tiberius into a Roman province, after being made a present of by Caligula to the Thracian Cotys, and by Nero to the Jewish king Aristobulus, were not reunited again to the Roman empire till Trajan's time.

Asia Anterior remained one of the brightest jewels in the Roman territorial crown, being blest above other lands with natural beauty, inexhaustible resources, and abundance of population, and was, moreover, the great industrial work-

shop of the empire. Here, in the countries of Mysia, Lydia, and Caria, which, together with a part of Phrygia, formed the Roman province of Asia, five hundred cities arose,[1] all richly endowed with works of art, public buildings and monuments of various kinds. Later on, there were reckoned to be at least one thousand cities, if the smaller towns were thrown into the computation.[2] Here the Greek mind and Greek customs lorded it, and made head against all foreign elements: here, surrounded by all that commerce, art, and the most refined luxury could procure, man lived an easy voluptuous life, and the Romans had no need of their legions for the maintenance of their authority. The cities prided themselves on their privilege of coining, for the Romans had granted them extensive municipal immunities: as, for instance, Smyrna, that fairest city of Asia, and one of the most beautiful of all antiquity, often afterwards desolated as she was by earthquakes and enemies' hands, and as often rising again out of her ruins under favour of her excellent harbour. Ephesus ranked as "the first and largest metropolis of Asia"—so she is distinguished in inscriptions. Pliny esteemed her an eye of Asia;[3] and her pride was her Temple of Artemis, the largest and most magnificent building of the Greek world.

Introduced by cities such as Sardes, Thyatira, Tralles, and Magnesia, Hellenism had so thoroughly penetrated even into the heart of Lydia, that in Strabo's time the Lydian dialect had already disappeared. In Mysia was Cyzicus, one of the most flourishing of seaside cities, and in favour with Romans of distinction as a place of resort. It had once been the intention of Cæsar to exalt the aspiring Alexandria-Troas to the dignity of metropolis of the whole empire. Pergamum had lost indeed its famous library, but still exhibited in so high a degree the character of a capital, which the kings of the Pergamean dynasty had imparted to it, that Pliny styles it by far the most renowned city of Asia.[4] Alabanda, the zealous partisan of Rome, with its dancing and singing women, ranked foremost amongst

[1] Philostr. *Vit. Sophist.* p. 56: 21, Kayser.; Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 16.
[2] *Stat. Silv.* ii. 2, 57.
[3] "Alterum lumen Asiæ," Plin. *H. N.* v. 29, 31.
[4] Plin. *H. N.* v. 30, 33.

Caria's cities, claiming the honour of having been the first to erect a temple to the goddess Roma.[1] Halicarnassus had not yet been able to recover completely from her demolition by Alexander, yet she congratulated herself on the privilege, so scarce and valuable amongst Asiatic cities, of being secure from earthquakes, by reason of her rocky foundation. The existing ruins of Cnidus bear witness to the magnificence and extent of that city.

Lycia, whose inhabitants in their peaceful lives displayed customs partly Cretan, and partly Carian, possessed twenty-three towns, which contrived to preserve their confederation even in Roman times; though the most considerable of them, Patara and Telmessus, were already far gone in decay: and Xanthus, the Lycian capital, could never lift its head again after its destruction by Brutus. Side and Aspendus, cities of Pamphylia, a small seaboard lying to the east of Lycia, were inhabited by the descendants of Greek colonists.

In the centre of Asia Minor, hemmed round completely by mountains, lay the fertile Phrygia, with its large cities, subsequently of importance in Christian history, Apamæ, Colosse, Laodicea, and Hierapolis, and with a population that for the last six hundred years had been accustomed to foreign masters, Lydian, Persian, Græco-Macedonian, and now, since the death of Attalus III., king of Pergamus, to Roman; yet it still preserved the consciousness of having formed a mighty kingdom at an earlier period, and of having been the oldest of people, and the first land that reappeared out of the waters of the Deluge, as domestic traditions testified.

Through the intellectual supremacy of the Greeks, by whom the entire land was encircled, and who soon had settled themselves in its very heart, the Phrygian race was already so completely overborne, that Phrygia seemed to be quite Greek, and the Phrygian tongue was only spoken in the country, and by slaves in the cities. The people, which had drawn down to its present settlements from the highlands of Armenia, to whose family races it was closely allied in old times, had formed the most considerable part of the population of Asia Minor, and had sent

[1] Tac. *Ann.* iv. 56.

important offshoots into Thrace, Macedonia, and Illyria; but, since Persian times, had fallen into general disrepute as intractable, cowardly, and effeminate. Of its cities, Synnada, still inconsiderable in Strabo's time, raised itself at a later period to be the capital of the whole of Phrygia Salutaris; Celænæ had declined from its former greatness into the condition of a market-town, a consequence of the proximity of the newly founded Apamæa. Meanwhile this Apamæa Cibotus had by commerce risen to be the most important city in Phrygia; Colosse, on the other hand, remained still but a small town. The wealthy Laodicea, on the river Lycus, utterly destroyed by an earthquake under Tiberius, was able to rebuild herself from her own resources.

The rich mountain land of Galatia, a Roman province since the death of its last prince, was inhabited by three Celtic tribes, the Trocmi, Tectosages, and Tolistoboii, who, in the year 278 B.C., having migrated from their seats between the Danube and the Alps, were for long the bravest people of Asia Minor, and remained still in possession of their Gallic tongue and Gallic customs.[1] Amongst its cities, Pessinus was now on the wane; whilst Ancyra, the middle point of the great highway from Byzantium into Syria, and the emporium of Oriental caravan traffic, was now flourishing as capital of the province.

The mountaineers in the south-east parts of Asia Minor—Pisidians, Isaurians, and Cilicians, all of kindred descent, and long devoted to piracy and the slave trade—were never completely subjugated to the Roman power. Not one Roman settlement or colony was to be found in the interior of Pisidia and Isauria. It was only by a chain of fortresses that the adjacent country could be secured against the predatory incursions of these tribes, who were inaccessible when they withdrew into their mountain fortresses. In spite of these fortresses, the Isaurians, who since the third century had formed themselves into one people with the inhabitants of Cilicia Trachea, had been the terror of all their neighbours. On the level land (*pedias*) along the seacoast lay a group of flourishing cities, with Greek language and civilisation; amongst them,

[1] Strabo, p. 566 (820, Oxf.).

the ancient Tarsus, metropolis of Cilicia, and in earlier times the seat of one of the kings dependent on the Persian monarchy. Its schools gave it importance in the history of the world; and even in Cilicia Trachea, which was first united under Vespasian, in the year 74, with the Roman province of Cilicia, lay Seleucia Trachea, a free city, which had become in consequence so large and beautiful, that Ammian,[1] in the fourth century, gave it the title of "Mother of Cities."

The islands of the Ægean and Eastern Mediterranean may be reckoned as some of the most valuable constituents of the vast empire. The rich Cyprus, vying even with Egypt in fertility and variety of produce, and, in olden times, divided into nine petty sovereignties, had a mixed population once pre-eminently Phenician, which, however, could not maintain their individuality when they came in contact with the intellectual superiority of their Hellenic neighbours, who had early settled as colonists in the island. In particular Citium, Salamis, and Amathus, cities of Phenician foundation, had already become thoroughly grecised. The primitive city, old Paphos, was known throughout the world for its cultus of Venus Aphrodite; and new Paphos, at only three hours' distance, was a harbour city, adorned with beautiful temples.

It required no army to keep Crete in check, with its medley population, partly Greek and partly Asiatic; a Roman colony at Gnossus was all that was necessary; and hence the island was a province of the senate. One could still distinguish here the Greek from the earlier Asiatic settler. However, the evil reputation which the Cretans had, throughout antiquity, for lying, greediness, debauchery, and impurity, attached alike to the whole population without distinction of Greek and barbarian.

The inhabitants of Rhodes, a lovely island lying off the Carian coast, were held in far better estimation. They were a mixture of Carians, Phenicians, Cretans, and Dorian Greeks, and the intellectual superiors of them all. True, the growth of this industrious and clever little people had been crushed in the civil wars ensuing after Cæsar's death, and the barbarous treatment it met with from Cassius; yet

[1] Ammian, xiv. 2.

still a stirring life, devoted to scientific and artistical pursuits, survived here, particularly in the capital of the same name: thus there was a Rhodian eloquence, and a Rhodian school of art, formed by Chares of Lindus. Of three islands on the coast of Asia, all richly endowed with the gifts of nature, Lesbos, Chios, and Samos, the last, with its capital city of the same name, one of the most beautiful of past ages, dwindled away more and more into insignificance under Roman dominion. The Chians, once the wealthiest of the Greeks,[1] were still proverbial for their life of enjoyment and voluptuousness; while the soft immoral Lesbos still lived upon the reputation of having given being to a long train of Grecian scholars, artists, and poets.

The most productive of the Roman provinces in proportion to its size was Egypt, the valley on the north-east of Africa, which, compressed between mountain chain and sand desert, is inundated year by year by the Nile from its seven outlets on the Mediterranean as far up as to the cataracts of Syene. The extraordinary fertility of this valley, the lie of the country, which enables the master of it to use it as a stronghold equally against Africa and Arabia, and the extreme importance of Alexandria as an emporium for the world's commerce, made the possession of Egypt of the last consequence to Rome; and the country which, under the thoughtless and good-for-nothing administration of the last Lagidæ, had retrograded in most points, under the statesmanlike dispositions of Augustus, and the indulgent, and at the same time safe, line of policy pursued by his successors, had risen again to greater prosperity than ever; so that the population reached the number of seven million eight hundred thousand.[2] This population consisted of old Egyptians (Copts), Greeks, and Jews. The attempts of the Lagidæ to hellenise Egypt, and to blend Greek and Egyptian to the uttermost, were not without their effect, as already the prevalence of Greek names testified, though without doubt the Egyptians formed the great bulk of the population; and thus Philo could describe the population of the land as presenting only a simple contrast of Jew and Egyptian.[3] This people, the oldest of the civilised nations

[1] Thucyd. viii. 45. [2] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 16, p. 4 (7,050,000?).
[3] In Flacc. v. 23, 28 (p. 971 B).

in the empire, during six centuries of its subjugation to the yoke of a stranger, the Persian and the Greek, had suffered the loss of almost all its old institutions. Its caste system had been broken up; its religion it still preserved, and to this it held fast with tenacious obstinacy: as the Romans carefully refrained from interference upon that head, thereby showing themselves wiser than the Persians, Egypt, in consequence, became one of the safest and most peaceable provinces of the empire. The people had always gone greater lengths than others in the exaltation and worship of sovereign authority: in the most ancient times it had deified its native rulers; then the Lagidæ; and so it was an easy matter to submit to the Roman emperors as new divinities. Within ten years after the death of Cleopatra, Augustus figured in hieroglyphic inscriptions on the temple of Isis at Phyle as "Son of the Sun, and King of Upper and Lower Egypt."[1]

On the whole, the people had withstood Greek influences more than other nations of the East; yet of all the more considerable nations of antiquity, the Egyptian was the one which was held in the greatest contempt, partly because of their worship of animals, despicable even in heathen eyes, as well as of the whole system of their wild and extravagant cultus; partly because of the deceitful, fawning, and unwarlike character they had assumed under a despotism of two thousand years' duration. Still, in the storms which burst upon the Egyptians,[2] firmness under suffering, and an energy of will, were displayed, which might have been elicited in the service of a good cause, and have been ennobled thereby.

Hardly dependent on the land, a republic in itself, enthroned on the narrow slip of soil between the Mediterranean Sea and the Lake Mareotis, sat Alexandria, the queen of cities and centre of the world's commerce; with a harbour in which more ships rode at anchor than in any other of the world; with temples and palaces that covered a fourth part of the area of the city; and with a population of eight hundred thousand souls. Alexandria was, like Rome, a congregating place for all nations. Here one saw,

[1] Sharpe, *Hist. of Egypt* (3rd edit. Lond. 1852), ii. 85.
[2] Amm. Marcell. xxii. 16, 23.

all the year round, men of every complexion, from the most distant zones; not only Greeks, Italians, Syrians, Arabians, Libyans, Cilicians, and Ethiopians, but Bactrians, Scythians, Persians, and Indians as well.[1] And so here a peculiar character had developed itself among the people, quite distinct from that of the rest of their fellow-countrymen. The Alexandrians were very hard workers; it struck the emperor Hadrian he saw no idlers there; at the same time they were frivolous, pleasure-seekers, noisy, and easily worked themselves up to tumult and bloodshed on very trifling provocation.

Memphis, with a mixed population resembling the Alexandrian, and the earliest capital of the country after the downfall of Thebes, was still a large city, only yielding the precedence to Alexandria in its thronged streets, its temples, and its palaces. It maintained itself as the chief seat of heathen cultus in its palmy state till the fourth century. Thebes, however, or the "great Diospolis," the oldest city of the whole world in Egyptian estimation, and Abydos as well, were already sunk into the condition of villages. Heliopolis, the old holy city, with its far-famed Temple of the Sun, was almost deserted; and Ptolemais, in Upper Egypt, had raised itself in consequence from a mere encampment for Greek soldiery to be the most considerable city of the country,—a city nearly as large as Memphis, entirely built by Greeks, and living under Greek laws.

It was only because they had so many monuments come down to them from former times that Egyptian cities of the interior had an importance for a wider circle; but in Syria it was otherwise, where flourishing city-like communities, with independent constitutions and ruling families, had already made head under Persian domination. These again, under the Seleucidæ, receiving an access of strength by the admixtion of the Græco-Macedonian element into their blood, and by the foundation of many new cities, became the centre and bulwark of Hellenism, in opposition to the Syrian country population. So that the native tongue partially disappeared before the tide of Greek language and customs flowing upwards from the flat

[1] Dio Chrysost. ad Alexand. p. 252 (vol. i. p. 672, Reiske).

country, or was considered as the dialect of an uncivilised people, alongside of the Greek. The Syrian people, by being split up into many races at enmity amongst themselves, and having no established nationality, no unity of customs, kept together by the bond of religion, to oppose to the intrusive stranger, appropriated the new and the foreign [1] far more readily, and underwent the process of hellenisation in a far higher degree, than the Egyptians did.

Thus the Romans obtained, according as it devolved to them, after the lingering dissolution of the kingdom of the Seleucidæ, the whole country in its continuity from Cilicia, between the Mediterranean and the Euphrates, as far as the Arabian desert and the extreme borders of Egypt; a rich and fertile inheritance, and in speech and civilisation pre-eminently Greek. For Syria was at that time far better cultivated and more productive than now, and had to the east flourishing cities, that have long since disappeared in the sand of the Syrian desert, even out beyond Palmyra. The people, as well as the Assyrians, Mesopotamians, white Syrians, and Cappadocians, all belonged to the Aramaic family. They were industrious, and possessed naturally intellectual powers, but were morally sunk through a servile disposition, the refinements of luxury, and pernicious religious influences. They had acquired a bad name among other nations for avarice and rapacity, and these drove the Syrian trafficker out into all lands, and taught him, with all his effeminacy, to despise danger.[2]

In Upper Syria, close upon the commencement of the Libanus range, lay the first seaport of Syria, Laodicea (also Hierapolis), which owed its size and importance to the worship of the goddess Atargatis. Then Apamæa and Emesa, on the Orontes; and on the same, Antioch, the creation of Seleucus and capital of Syria, with which at one time no other city but Rome and Seleucia on the Tigris could compare in size and beauty, though Alexandria was its superior in monumental magnificence. This rich, voluptuous city had its arch-enemy underground; ten times in seven centuries was it visited with earthquakes, more than

[1] Polyb. xxii. 26. (?)

[2] The passages on this point are collected by Savaron in the notes to Sidon. Apollin. p. 61.

once almost completely destroyed. In Julian's time, Libanius asserted that it was the fourth city that now stood on the ruins of Antioch, three having been already destroyed. The Antiochenes, however, united Greek civilisation with Syrian petulance, showed themselves thoughtless, turbulent, and overbearing; and whilst one Cæsar conceived they were good for nothing but elegant and witty banter, another asserted that there were more comedians than citizens in Antioch.[1] In Lower or Cœle-Syria shone the primeval Damascus, a city in existence in Abraham's time. Slighted by Syrian sovereigns as an insecure possession, it recovered itself under the Roman power, as well as Heliopolis (Baalbec), on Libanus, where Antoninus Pius afterwards erected the temple of Jupiter, one of the most renowned structures of the old world.

Phenicia, a narrow tract of land, lying hardly 140 miles along the coast, belonged now to the province of Syria. Like the rest of the Syrians, the Phenicians too had been grecised under the sway of the Seleucidæ. Their national history had long since come to a close. After being dependent in turns on the Assyrians, Chaldeans, Persians, Macedonians, and the Egyptian Ptolemies, and now finally on the Romans, they had preserved but little of their individuality. Their language had died out in the mother country about the middle of the second century after Christ, whilst it was still in use in the African colonies in the sixth century.[2] The Phenicians themselves, however, still maintained their ancient reputation, as the most active commercial people in the world, and as being greatly distinguished in architecture and the plastic arts. Sidon, the old mother city, and Tyre, the island one, were still, and had been long, busy cities of commerce; and Berytus, after its destruction by Tryphon, the Syrian dynast, and restoration under Augustus, had been raised to the rank of a Roman military colony, and became at a later period the seat of a flourishing university.

The low country to the south on the seacoast, before Palestine, and formerly so styled *par excellence*, had been occupied in old times by a tribe of Philistines, who had

[1] Herodian. ii. 10; Julian. *Misopogon*, p. 344, Spanh.
[2] Hamaker, *Miscell. Phœnic.* p. 114.

migrated thither from Egypt. This people was without a nationality of its own; it had been ground down by troubles in the constant wars between its powerful neighbours, Egypt and Asiatic conquerors, and again under the blows inflicted upon it by its hereditary enemy, the Jews. Its cities were ruined; Gaza, in particular, reduced to a state of thorough desolation by the Jewish Prince Alexander Jannæus, in the year 96 B.C., and Ascalon by Judas Maccabæus. The country population existed now only under the general name of Idumæans. The Romans, however, Pompey, and after him Gabinius, founded new cities here; a new Gaza and a new Ascalon arose, then Anthedon and Raphia, with mixed inhabitants and Greek civilisation.

Between Phenicia, Arabia Petræa, and the vast Syro-Arabic desert, extending from the Nile to the Euphrates, lay Palestine, or Judæa, a country in Roman occupation since the year 63 B.C. When they first penetrated into it under Pompey, after the conquest of Syria, the Romans found it in the possession of a people who had assumed the name of Jews from the time that a small portion of the nation returned from the Babylonian and Assyrian captivities. These Jews, under valiant captains and princes of the priestly race of the Maccabees, particularly under Hyrcanus the First, who died in the year 106 B.C., again developed themselves into a powerful and flourishing kingdom. But the descendants of the same family brought themselves down again by internal discord. The Romans disposed of the country at pleasure: Pompey annexed the northern part of it to Syria; Cæsar appointed an Idumæan, Antipater, procurator of the whole of Judæa, in reward for services rendered. It is true, the last Maccabee, Antigonus, made use of the momentary authority of the Parthians in Syria to have himself set up as ruler in Jerusalem. This was but a brief interlude. The Romans, at the instance of Antony and Octavian, declared Antigonus an enemy of the Roman people, and Antipater's son, Herod, king of Judæa, in the year 39 B.C. From that date, this stranger, the son of an Idumæan and of an Arabian woman, lorded it with an iron hand for thirty-seven years over a people who, above all others, held a foreign master in abhorrence. Flatterer and slave of the Romans, he had the cunning to

win over to his ends Cassius, Antony, and Augustus in turns. By favour of the last named, he ascended higher and higher. Under his protection he was enabled to defy with impunity the hatred and disgust of the Jews, elicited by his introducing and adopting Roman customs, by tyrannical extortion, and lavishly wasting the sums he extorted upon strangers, and by executions *en masse*. After his death, his kingdom was divided amongst his posterity, till, under the emperor Claudius, his grandson, Herod Agrippa, became again sovereign of all Palestine, though but for a short time; for, on his dying suddenly, in the year 44 A.D., the whole country became a Roman province administered by procurators.

Under the Roman dominion, the country on this side the Jordan was formed into three grand divisions—Galilee, Judæa, and Samaria. The rich and fertile Galilee, its northern division, where, according to Josephus, two hundred and four cities and towns were to be met with, the smallest of which counted fifteen thousand inhabitants,[1] had a warlike and intrepid population composed of Israelites mixed with Phenicians and Syrians. Tiberias ranked as the foremost of its cities, though only just built by Herod Antipas, who gave it its name in honour of Tiberius Cæsar, and raised it to the dignity of capital of Lower Galilee. This prince besides converted Sephoris, under the name of Dio-Cæsaræa, into a strong fortress, and made it the capital of all Galilee; and it also became at the same time the seat of one of the five great Jewish Sanhedrim.

Samaria, the smallest of the three divisions, lay to the south of Galilee, and on the north-east of Judæa. It was a beautiful, mountainous, and yet fertile little territory, in excellent cultivation, whose inhabitants—a mixed people, half Israelite, half heathen—were ecclesiastically cut off from the Jews, and by them hated as an apostate and alien race. The whole history of the people attached to its two cities, Neapolis and Samaria. The first of these was the old Sichem, destroyed in the Jewish wars; it was situated between Mounts Ebal and Gerizim, at the foot of the latter. Samaria, which had risen again from its ruins after being demolished by Hyrcanus, was enlarged by Herod, to whom

[1] *Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 2.

Augustus gave it, and adorned with magnificent buildings, among which a temple of Augustus was conspicuous, and called Sebaste, in honour of the same Cæsar. It had a considerable population, composed of natives and Roman veterans.

Just as fertile and thickly populated as Samaria was Judæa, bounded to the east by the Jordan and the Dead Sea; to the south by deserts. It was inhabited by Jews and Jewish proselytes, that is, circumcised Idumæans, and Jews who spoke Greek. Near to the northern border, by the sea, lay Cæsaræa, before called Strato's Tower (*Turris Stratonis*), and only inhabited by Greeks and Syrians, until enlarged by Herod, and adorned with a beautiful temple of Augustus, when it received Jewish settlers in addition. Previously the seat of the governor, it became the capital after the destruction of Jerusalem. The old Canaanitish city Jericho was now also dwelt in by many Arabs and Egyptians. Nearly in the centre of the country lay the often conquered and often plundered Jerusalem, with its population of one hundred and fifty thousand. The city was built on three, or, more strictly speaking, four hills. On Sion was the upper town, with the city of David and the finest buildings. The hill Acra formed the lower town. On Moria stood the Temple, the wonder of the land. It was built throughout of the purest white marble, which appeared to the traveller at a distance like a mountain of snow. Adjoining it was the citadel of Antonia, now a Roman fortress prison, dominating the temple and whole city. On a hill to the north, which Herod Agrippa first threw into the city, the overflowing population built itself the new town Bezetha.

A more complete contrast can hardly be conceived than that presented by Roman North Africa under the Cæsars, and in its later occupation by Mahometan masters. With a quick growth, New Carthage advanced into the importance and magnitude of a city of the first class. Their ruins still bear testimony to the beauty and size of other cities, such as Utica, Hippo, Tagaste, Cirta, and Lambesa. The five hundred episcopal sees, counted in West Africa in the fourth century, are a speaking evidence of the flourishing condition of a well-peopled country: in its towns, as far as

Mauritania, the Latin tongue was the prevalent one; whilst in the country the Punic tongue maintained itself long amongst the descendants of Phenician colonists.

To the west of Egypt, Marmarica belonged to Roman jurisdiction, a sandy, waterless, and unfruitful land, far, however, from being such a complete desert then as now. The inhabitants lived in nomad fashion, without any towns of importance. Next came the Pentapolis, from which, in like manner, every living thing has now withdrawn. It had a population partly Greek, partly Jewish, a fertile and well-cultivated soil, and already formed a Roman province with Crete. On the coast was Ptolemais, a magnificent city; in the interior, Cyrene, from its happy situation as a place of commerce, art, and science, had become the largest and most beautiful city of North Africa after Carthage.

The Romans, as heirs of the Carthaginians, whom they had annihilated, and of the kingdom of Numidia, possessed the whole of North Africa, from the Pentapolis to the Western Ocean. Proconsular Africa, separated as a province from Numidia since the year 39 B.C., had its centre at New Carthage. The site of old Carthage was, in fact, under an interdict and accursed, and had been turned into pasture land. Hard by, however, the citizen colony of three thousand families, sent out by Augustus, sprang up with such rapidity, as, by Tiberius's time, to have become the first city of Africa, and one which soon contended with Alexandria for the position of the second in the empire.[1] To the east, in the Syrtes, lay Leptis, a Sidonian colony, and a commercial city with a large population down to the fourth century. Utica, renowned for the death-scene of Cato, was only surpassed by Carthage in size. In the interior, and built on a steep rock, was Cirta, peopled by Greeks since King Micipsa's time, and now that it had received a Roman colony, the largest and richest city of Numidia.

It was also under Claudius that the western part of North Africa, or Mauritania,—the Fez and Morocco of the present day, including a part of Algeria,—was first incorporated with the Roman empire, and divided into two extensive provinces. Accordant testimonies of antiquity

[1] Herodian. vii. 6. 2 (Irmisch).

paint in very unfavourable colours the character of the two cognate races, the Numidian and the Moorish; they are described as crafty, deceitful, and treacherous, as easily excited to sudden and violent action, and yet as daring despisers of danger and death. They contributed to the weakening of the empire by a long succession of insurrections, sometimes serious, sometimes not, but always put down with difficulty. In the country to the south there was another language spoken, the Libyan, beside the Punic, which for some time still maintained itself amongst them. The cities in which, as a consequence of colonisation, the Roman language and customs prevailed, were, particularly in Numidia, seats of scientific culture; Sicca, Cirta, Cæsaræa, Madaura, Tagaste, Tubursica, were distinguished in this respect; and the Africo-Roman literature displayed a peculiar, fiery, and yet often turgid eloquence, which took pleasure in out-of-the-way and far-fetched expressions.

After a struggle that lasted some two centuries, Spain was conquered through the overpowering tactics and policy of the Romans. Singly and successively the nations of the Peninsula were mastered; the last of them, the Cantabrians, were first subdued in the year 19 B.C. From the blending effected in Mid-Spain of the Iberian aborigines with the Celts who had come in as conquerors, sprang the Celtiberians, amongst whom, however, the Iberian, and not the Gallic, character prevailed. The five powerful races of Cantabrians, Asturians, Vascons, Gallæcians, and Lusitanians, in the north and west, were unmixed Celts. The leading people in the south of Spain were the Iberian Turdetani on the Bœtis, the cleverest and most cultivated of all the Iberian tribes, possessing, in fact, a literature of their own, historical books, popular lays, and ancient ordinances thrown into a metrical form. Yet even they, in Strabo's time, were almost thoroughly romanised, and had widened the breach with their antecedents by going so far as to unlearn their mother tongue. The artful and inconstant Lusitanians, up to the coming of the Romans, had left their excellent soil uncultivated, in order to pursue the constant inroads and endless feuds of their several races. The Celtiberians in south-western Aragon, the most warlike people of Spain, had accustomed themselves, since the fall

of Sertorius, to Roman language and manners. On one side, pride, craft, and reserve; on the other, great temperance, physical endurance, and firmness in bearing pain, struck the Greeks and Romans as salient points in the Iberian character.[1]

Augustus divided the Peninsula into three great provinces; Tarraconensis in the north, Bœtica in the south-east, and Lusitania in the south-west. Spain obtained, what it had hitherto wanted, unity of administration and a large number of cities; and these, adorned with noble buildings and monuments, even in their ruins awoke a high conception of their former flourishing state and the inexhaustible resources of the country. The Roman-Spanish aqueducts, as still preserved at Segovia, the examples of the same at Merida, Toledo, and Tarragona; the enormous theatres, as that at Saguntum; the circus and warm baths; the bridges, for instance that wondrous one at Alcantara; the triumphal arches, and excellent military roads which penetrated Spain in many directions,—all showed how much combined energy and skill had been imparted by the contact of the Italians with the Iberian population, whose dwellings not so long ago consisted of huts of straw or of trodden earth.[2]

The five-and-twenty Roman colonies took the first rank amongst the cities. These, peopled either by Roman citizens or legionary soldiers, became so many centres and schools for the acquisition and extension of Roman customs and language. Thus originated the city Leon (Legio), as being the settlement of the seventh legion. Thus too Emerita Augusta (Merida), for it was here Augustus placed the Emeriti, or soldiers of the fifth and tenth legions who had completed their time of service; and also Pax Julia (Beja) and Cæsar-Augusta (Saragossa). By the year 171 B.C. there were in Carteja four thousand soldiers settled, whose mothers were all Spanish women.

Forty-nine municipal towns (*municipia*) had not, it is true, all the rights of colonies, but still that of independence. Next came the cities under the Latin law, whose inhabitants, by holding offices, could acquire the rights of Roman citizenship; six so-called free or independent cities;

[1] Strabo, iii. p. 165; Justin. xliv. 2; Valer. Max. iii. 3.
[2] Plin. *H. N.* xxxv. 48; Vitruv. *de Architec.* ii. 1.

some few confederated towns with similar privileges; and lastly those which paid tribute, on whom the heavy burden of taxes principally pressed. These distinctions came to be effaced in time. Already Vespasian gave the Latin law to the Spanish cities, which had not yet received it; and Caracalla, by his general extension of the rights of citizenship, put the finishing stroke upon all inequality.

In Rome, Spain, on the score of the richness of her mines and the unsurpassed fertility of her land, was regarded and treated as an inexhaustible storehouse. She was obliged to send the twentieth part of her corn harvest thither. Indeed, the wealth of the Peninsula was proverbial. A single city like Cadiz counted four hundred equites, each of whom had necessarily a fortune of at least four hundred thousand sestertia. In literature, a regular school, the Spanish-Roman, was formed, and sustained by poets like Lucan and Martial, philosophers like Seneca, and by Florus, Mela, and Columella; and this school, with its characteristics of sententious emphasis and rhetorical antithesis, exercised a very considerable influence on literature and taste in Rome.

Beyond the Pyrenees, and bounded by them and the Alps, the Atlantic, and Mediterranean Sea, and the Rhine, lay Gaul, the headquarters of the Celtic race, which Cæsar, by the sacrifice of about a million lives, had completely subjected to the Roman arms. The Celtic race, once the most powerful and widest spread in the West, was divided into two great branches, that of the Gauls, and that of the Cymri. The Galli, or Gauls, already in early times spread widely over Gaul, Britain, and a part of Italy, penetrated deep into the Pyrenean peninsula, and, being there partially mixed with Iberians, had, in the seventh century before Christ, lost nearly the half of Gaul before the advancing pressure of the Cymri in that direction from Germany. Later on, at the beginning of the fourth century, the Belgians, a branch of the Cymri settled in Germany, had forced their way into the north of Gaul, between the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Seine. Thus, at the time of the Roman conquest of Gaul, its population consisted of Aquitanians, between the Garonne and the Pyrenees, who were quite distinct from the Gauls and Belgians in

race, language, bodily form, and countenance, bearing a greater resemblance to the Iberians; of the original Gallians or Gauls, who, forming the larger proportion of the population, occupied the country from the Garonne to the Seine and Marne, and between the Atlantic and the Vosges; and also of the Belgians in the north. To these must be added the Ligurians, who, probably of Iberian descent, dwelt on the coast of the Mediterranean, in the country between the eastern Pyrenees and the Alps.

That the conquest of Gaul was the work of a few years, while the subjugation of Spain cost two hundred years of persevering effort, may partly be attributed to the surpassing genius of Cæsar; partly, and in still greater degree, to the character of the Gauls, who were ripe for the loss of their independence and for the yoke of a foreign power. A general breaking up into parties, and a spirit of faction that penetrated into the very heart of families, was the first thing that came under the observation of the Romans in Gaul. A number of petty tribes stood side by side, the less under the protection of the greater; many were united together by voluntary associations; all were wavering and shifting, and the several confederations were almost always taking up arms one against the other. Whilst in the country the system of clanship, the peculiarity of Celtic nations, was ever working more towards division than consolidation, a democratic movement was developing in the towns, which was utterly opposed to clanism and the authority of the nobles. Monarchy was so hated in Gaul, that death or banishment threatened those who aspired to it. The priest class, too, of the Druids was far short of being a political centre: it was no longer hereditary, but supplied by election, and does not appear to have been in a situation to counteract effectually the political disunion of the nation, or the civil wars breaking out year by year. Thus, through their discord, the Gauls went on to ruin; throughout the whole of the war against Cæsar, it was only in the last year that unity and combined operation manifested itself among the most important Gallic factions; but then it was too late.

The character of the Gauls always excited the astonishment of the persevering, earnest, disciplined Roman; on the

one hand, judicious, apt, and docile, easily enticed to study and to intellectual activity, sociable, cheerful, and inquisitive to an excess; on the other, exhibiting themselves thoughtless, fickle, and fond of innovation, irritable, easily roused to fury and violence, insolent and elated at once in good fortune, but cast down in bad. They were accustomed, we are told, to break their promises with a smile on their lips. A strange medley of barbarism and civilisation showed itself in them. Even in Strabo's time, as much as fifty years after their conquest, the greater part of them slept on the bare ground; although, according to Cæsar's observation, they did not live so simply and poorly as the Germans. The women, who in earlier times occupied a more dignified position, and one more on a level with the men, were at that time sunk deep below them. The husband had the right of life and death over wife and children; and as even the boys were not allowed to associate with their elders, it was impossible to conceive the idea of real domestic life amongst them; thus they fell the more readily into the vice of drunkenness. The custom of hanging the skulls of slain enemies to the necks of their horses or up in their houses, and of using them as drinking-cups at banquets, disappeared under Roman rule. Their towns were but large open villages, without extensive buildings or any artificial defence. For civil uses, they employed Greek writing; but no literature, properly speaking, appears to have existed among them, although a regular system of doctrines was to be met with amongst the Druids, which, however, was only propagated by word of mouth.

Through their incorporation into the Roman empire, an extraordinary change took place in the aspect of things amongst the Gauls in a comparatively short time; and yet, of all the nations subjugated by Rome, the Gauls evinced by far the greatest inclination to cut themselves loose again, and establish themselves afresh as an independent state. Attempts of the kind were frequently made up to Vespasian's time; then a period of repose came; but even in the third century, in the time of the emperor Gallienus, they again had a Cæsar of their own. Meantime, notwithstanding the desire of independence,

the process of romanising went steadily onward amongst them. After the pattern of Roman colonisation in the south, the Gaulish villages and market-towns were transformed into well-built cities; and Josephus, in his time, speaks of the flourishing state of Gaul, with its three hundred and five peoples, and twelve hundred cities and towns.[1] Italian merchants, money-changers, and farmers of the revenue, had settled extensively in the country, spreading far and wide the Roman language and municipal institutions. Cicero, in his time, said that not a silver coin was in circulation in Narbonensis that had not passed through a Roman's hand. It is true that they were hated, and that tumults frequently arose out of their assassination, as at Genabum (Orleans).[2] Still their influence was abiding, and the Celtic tongue disappeared more and more.

Cæsar had already begun to adopt distinguished Gauls out of Narbonensis into the senate. Claudius established the rule, that Gauls, even of the other three provinces, should be chosen into it; others were led through the extension of the rights of citizenship, or of the equestrian dignity, or through military service in the legions, to the adoption of Roman customs and ideas. Clanism went out before the all-levelling machinery of Roman state policy and jurisprudence. The Cæsars were eager to crush the influence of the Druids. Roman schools of rhetoric, grammar, medicine, and philosophy, besides the cities of Narbonensis, had also Autun, Lyons, and Bordeaux to boast of. Hand in hand with civilisation, effeminacy stole over the Gauls, which even the Belgians, the strongest and bravest part of the population, could not resist. Tacitus points to the Gauls as rich and unwarlike, and as having lost their high courage with their independence.[3]

Under Augustus, Agrippa divided the whole of Gaul into four provinces. Narbonensis, which, as being an old Roman possession before Cæsar's time, was till then designated "the Province," comprised the present Languedoc, Provence, and Dauphiné. Here the great and beautiful Roman colony Narbo was capital. Arles, on the Rhone, still in possession of the greatest remains of Roman

[1] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 16. [2] Cæs. *B. G.* vii. 3.
[3] *Ann.* xi. 18; *Germ.* 28; *Agric.* xi.

magnificence and architecture of all the French cities was built by the veterans of the sixth legion. To the size and beauty of the city Nemausus (Nismes), its antiquities, rivalling in magnificence even those of Arles, bear ample testimony.

The old Greek city Massilia (Marseilles), founded by the Phocæans, so long flourishing, strong, and powerful by sea and land, so long the trusty helpmate and ally of Rome, was at last disarmed by Cæsar. Though afterwards reduced to a Roman provincial city, it was always of such importance as the seat of Greek civilisation for the Gauls as well as the Italians, that the noblest Romans resorted thither rather than to Athens for the purpose of pursuing their courses of philosophical studies.[1] With reason, people admired in the Massilians the indestructible, unvarying elasticity of the Greek spirit, which here, so far from Hellas and quite encircled by barbarians,[2] still kept such firm hold on Grecian manners and ideas. Tacitus himself praises the excellent combination of Greek elegance with provincial reserve, as peculiarly favourable to the studies of young men. Vienne, the capital of the settlers in the modern Dauphiné and Savoy, was a Roman colony, with a population of Allobroges, converted from a warlike into an agricultural one, and was the rival of its neighbour Lugdunum (Lyons), the bitterest enmity existing between the two.

Gallia Lugdunensis, the largest of the four provinces, embraced all the country between the Cevennes and the Loire, and between the Rhone, the Sâone, and Seine. The capital, Lugdunum (Lyons), on the confluence of the Rhone and Sâone (Arar), a Roman colony, made so rapid an advance, that, after resisting for a few decennia, it soon became the most populous city thereabouts next to Narbo, and the headquarters of industrial activity, where, besides Gauls and Romans, considerable numbers of Greeks and North Africans were employed in a variety of crafts and manufactures. As birthplace of two Cæsars, Claudius and Caracalla, it had privileges showered upon it, particularly by the first named. Though annihilated in one night, in Nero's days, by a conflagration, it speedily

[1] Strabo, p. 181 (248, Oxf.). [2] Cic. *pro Flacco*, 26.

arose to new prosperity; and more than one Cæsar chose it for a place of prolonged sojourn. The most important town of the Ædui, who had become effeminate by Cæsar's time, and were the first to give in to the Romans, was Augustodunum (Autun), a much-frequented place of study at a later period. Lutetia, the capital of the Parisii, on an island of the Seine, did not for some time show any promise of her future greatness and importance in the world's history, wherein no mention is made of her in the four centuries from Cæsar to Julian.

The province of Aquitania, little known to the Romans in earlier times, was left by Cæsar, *en passant*, to be conquered by his legate Crassus, as it were unworthy of himself. In fact, the division of the Aquitani into more than a score of small tribes did not allow any resistance in earnest to be thought of. A revolt under Augustus ended speedily in a renewed subjugation. The Aquitani, after being romanised, were famous for their elegant scientific education;[1] still no cities of importance could be raised amongst them, on account of their internal divisions. The most important was Burdigala (Bordeaux), the capital of a single Celtic tribe, the Bituriges, in old Aquitania, right in the heart of small Iberian tribes. It was in high repute as a place of commerce, and afterwards also as a principal seat of scientific studies.

The maintenance of order in the province Belgica, and its defence, was a far harder task for Rome. This province included not only the territory of the Belgæ, in particular, but in general the whole country between the Northern Ocean on the west, the Rhine on the north and east, the Seine, Rhone, and Sâone to the south. In the present Hainault, Namur, and part of Luxembourg, were settled the remains of a once powerful and very valiant people, the Nervii, who, however, had been mostly destroyed by Cæsar, and who possessed no large towns. Eastward from them, in woods and marshes, not far from the mouth of the Rhine, dwelt the Menapii; and to the north, as far as the shore of the ocean, the Batavi, principally on the island formed by the estuaries of the Rhine and Mosa (Meuse). These, originally a German people, in alliance

[1] Auson. *de Clar. Urb.* xiv. 1–3; Sulp. Sev. *Dial.* i. 20.

with the Romans, and as such incorporated in the empire and considered a part of Gallia-Belgica, afterwards excited the terrible insurrection under Claudius Civilis, to their own destruction. To the south of the Nervii, and separated from them by the forest of Ardennes, and between the Remi and the Rhine, lay the Treviri, according to Mela, the most distinguished of the Belgian tribes, and only allies of the Romans. They and the Nervii, according to the observation of Tacitus, were anxious to pass for Germans,[1] whilst Cæsar takes them to be Gauls; it is certain they lived in perpetual quarrels with the Germans. Their capital, Trêves, on the Moselle, was, as a Roman colony, styled Augusta-Trevirorum, and became gradually, by commerce, by possessing schools for education, and as a residence of the later Roman emperors, one of the most flourishing and important cities of Gaul.

The countries on the west bank of the Rhine, inhabited for the most part by German tribes, had been divided by the Romans since the time of Tiberius into first and second, or upper and lower, Germany. In Upper Germany, between the Vosges and the Rhine, three German tribes, the Vangiones, Tribocci, and Nemetes, were settled about Strasburg, Worms, and Speyer, who, before Cæsar's time, had immigrated hither, dispossessing the Celtic tribes. Their cities, which did not grow into consideration till later times, were Argentoratum (Strasburg), Borbetomagus (Worms), Noviomagus, afterwards Speyer, and Moguntia (Mentz). Lower Germany extended from the country of the Vangiones, or the neighbourhood of the Rhine, downwards to the Scheldt, as far as the Belgian Nervii, yet so that the Treviri and Nervii were apportioned to the province Belgica. Here dwelt the Ubii, transplanted in the year 37 B.C. by Agrippa to the left bank of the Rhine, which they held from Bingen as low down as Gelduba (Gelb). From their capital, Cologne, they had taken the name of Agrippinenses; for Claudius, at the desire of his consort Agrippina, who was born there, sent a Roman colony to it, and since then it has been called Colonia Agrippina. Their next neighbours were the Tongri, with their chief town Tongres. These Pliny reckons as a non-German race.

[1] *Germ.* xxviii.

The great island of the west, hardly known to the ancients, not even considered part of Europe, and only visited by a few adventurous mariners, came first, through Cæsar, within the grasp of the Roman spirit of conquest; but it was not till the year 43 that Claudius undertook the subjugation of Britain in earnest. It was advancing slowly, when a great rising took place, in the year 61, which led to the destruction of the Roman colonies of Camulodunum, Verulamium, and Londinium, and to the slaughter of 70,000 Roman inhabitants. Notwithstanding this, the military superiority of the Romans was again triumphant, and Agricola completed the conquest of Britain as far as into the south of Scotland. Though Strabo expresses himself disparagingly of the value and fertility of the island, at a later period it was looked on as one of the most highly favoured provinces of the empire.[1] The inhabitants were Celts, partly Galli, partly Cymri. The Belgæ on the seacoast, the Atrebates on the Thames, the Cenomani on the Stour, the Parisii on the Humber, were all connected by descent with the tribes of the same name on the mainland of Gaul, and pointed to an early emigration from the north of Gaul. The Druid worship they shared in common was also a still closer bond of unity between Britain and Gaul; and the design of the Romans, to attack and give the deathblow to Druidism in its last stronghold and citadel, Britain, appears to have entered largely into the enterprise under Claudius.

In spite of the perfection to which the Druid system had arrived amongst them, the Britons were very low in the scale of civilisation at the time of the Roman conquest. Their towns were nothing but woods, surrounded by a mound of earth and a ditch. They tattooed themselves, and wore the skins of wild beasts; and had also, if Cæsar be not deceived in this respect, a community of wives amongst relations;[2] and in the interior they lived on flesh and milk, without tilling the ground. In rudeness and barbarity, but also in frankness and fair dealing, they surpassed the Gauls,[3] with whom, as with descendants

[1] Strabo, ii. p. 116 (154, Oxf.); Eumen. *Paneg. Const.* xi.
[2] *B. G.* v. 14; Herodian. iii. 14; Dio Cass. lxxvi. 12.
[3] Diod. v. 21; Dio Cass. lxii. 7; Tacit. *Agr.* xi.

of the same stock, they had most points of character in common. So soon, however, as the Roman authority was securely established amongst them, the British Celts, like their neighbours of Gaul, took kindly to the Roman customs and language. It was specially the wise policy and mild administration of Agricola which achieved this; and, according to the expression of his son-in-law, brought it to pass, that "what in their ignorance they termed civilisation, was in reality one of the conditions of their servitude."[1] At the same time, the separation of the unsubdued North Britain, with its tribes of Caledonians and Picts, also of Celtic race, from the romanised Britons of the south, was assured for many centuries in advance. Under the Roman domination, too, twenty-eight cities gradually rose in the island; of these, two were municipia, Eboracum (York), the basis of operations for all the Roman expeditions against the northern tribes, and frequently the residence of Roman emperors, with Verulam and nine colonies. London, already in existence as a place of commerce before the Roman invasion, and well-nigh destroyed in the insurrection under Boadicea, recovered itself, and was again, in the time of Antoninus Pius, a city of importance.

In the present Germany, Augustus, through his stepsons Drusus and Tiberius, had added to the empire the whole of the Alpine chain as far as the Danube, under the names of the provinces of Rhætia, Noricum, and Pannonia. The Romans did not consider these countries parts of Germany proper; before their conquest they were included in Illyria. Rhætia in its more limited sense comprised the Grisons, Tyrol, and a part of Lombardy. Previously in the occupation, it is said, of a Tuscan race, since the Romans knew it, it had been inhabited by tribes of Celtic descent. Vindelicia was regarded as a part of Rhætia from the end of the first century: afterwards, as a province by itself, and called Rhætia Secunda, it embraced portions of Switzerland, Baden, Wirtemburg, and Bavaria: its Celtic inhabitants were in part removed by the triumphant Romans to other localities. None of its cities, Tridentum, Campodunum, Brigantium, Augusta, or Reginum, appear to have been of

[1] Tac. *Agr.* xxi.

importance; the population of the country was, on the contrary, decreasing. Yet Tacitus mentions Augusta (Augsburg) as an extremely fine colony of the Rhætian province.

The province of Noricum comprised the present upper and lower Austria between the Inn, the Danube, and forest of Vienna, the greater part of Styria and Carinthia, and the territory of Saltzburg, and was inhabited by a people then still Celtic, the Taurisci. The town of Lauriacum, on the Danube, afterwards of so much political and ecclesiastical importance, probably arose under the emperor Marcus Aurelius. The old capital of the country, and centre of the Norican gold and iron trade, was Noreia, in Styria. The country could not attain to any degree of prosperity, inasmuch as it was hardly anything but a battlefield, over which the devastations of the Germans, and the equally ferocious reprisals of the Roman legions, alternated with but little interruption. The fair and fertile land between the Inn and the forest of Vienna was called at that time "the waste of the Boii," because that Celtic tribe was either annihilated on the spot, or thence expelled by the Getæ.

Further to the east lay Pannonia, on the south of the Danube, including the eastern parts of Austria, Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, the whole of Hungary between the Danube and the Save, and a part of Croatia and Bosnia. Those enormous plains, extending between the Danube and the Alps, the western portions of which formed the upper Pannonian, and the eastern the lower Pannonian provinces, were inhabited by a numerous and warlike tribe of Illyrian descent, a rude and wild people with whom some few small Celtic tribes were intermixed. These Pannonians, the Romans, under the order of Tiberius, were obliged to reduce afresh. The struggle was a bloody one, and lasted for many years. To the old Pannonian towns of Nauportus, Siscia, and Sirmium, new ones were now added by the Romans: the originally Celtic town, Vindobona, afterwards converted into a Roman municipium, served as a military arsenal, and continued for long a flourishing city; Sabaria, the old Boian town (now Stein am Anger); Petovio (Pettau in Styria) on the Drave; and Segesta, or Siscia (Sissock), in the time of Augustus the most important city in all

Pannonia, but depressed afterwards when Sirmium, the old town of the Celtic Taurisci on the left bank of the Drave, arose, which, from being the chief depôt of all military stores in the expeditions against the Dacians and other Danubian tribes, became the real capital of Pannonia.

To the east of the Adriatic Sea, over the modern Dalmatia, Bosnia, a part of Croatia and Albania, extended the Roman Illyria, with a people which, according to the testimony of the ancients, was originally connected by descent with the Thracians, but had developed itself independently of them. They also, particularly the tribes of the Iapydes, had a portion of Celtic blood. There were no towns of note here. The Greek Illyria, afterwards new Epirus, comprehending the larger part of the present Albania, was in a state of sad desolation in consequence of the wars of earlier times; it was only on the coast that cities flourished—Dyracchium, a great place of commerce, for instance, and Apollonia, much frequented as a place of scientific study by Romans of distinction.

Macedonia, the country whose people and king, three hundred years before, laid the foundation of that great empire of the world, the precursor of the Roman, had been now for a hundred and fifty years incorporated in this last. Enfeebled by the magnitude of its conquests and the long-continued emigrations which resulted from them, Macedonia, under Alexander's successors, had succumbed in the struggle against the northern barbarians, and in useless efforts to compel the Greeks to unite with it. A single battle in the time of Perseus put the whole country into the hands of the Romans; and they, finding it too small and unimportant to make a province of by itself, united it to Illyria and Thessaly, while the strip of coast lying to the east from the Nestus was attached to Thrace. Thus Macedonia reached, in the days of the Cæsars, from the Adriatic to the Ægean. The still warlike population of Macedonia proper had supplied Brutus, in the war against the Triumvirs, with two legions. Enclosed within the four walls of its mountain chain, this Macedonia was the fortress from which the Romans kept watch and ward over the restless predatory tribes of the valley of the Danube. On its north and north-western mountain quarters, the original

Illyrian race, only half subjugated by the Romans, and long a source of dread to them, preserved their non-Grecian customs and language: the flat country was, and continued to be, Greek. Thessalonica, still in its youth, now began, as capital of one of the four districts of Macedon, to rise into greater importance, and became one of the largest commercial cities of the old world. The Athenian colony Amphipolis, Philippi, made a Roman one by Augustus, and Pella, the old residence of the kings of Macedon and birth-place of Alexander, but soon after shrunk into the dimensions of a village, were the capitals of the three other districts.

To the east of Macedonia lay Thrace, a name of much more limited signification now than when in use amongst the Greeks, and signifying only the south-eastern part of old Thrace, south of the Hæmus (Balkan). Though generally mountainous, it had an extensive plain lying between Hæmus and Rhodope. The Thracians had immigrated, in prehistoric times, into the country, divided into a number of single clans, each with a chief of its own. They belonged, with the Getæ, or Dacians, and the Bithynians in Asia Minor, to one great family, whose customs bear a strong resemblance to those of the Germans and Celts. The marked disinclination they displayed in old times to the cultivation of the soil, and other peaceful occupations, had already yielded, before the period of Roman domination, to an agrarian and industrial activity: but a predilection for war and robbery, contempt of death, and drunkenness, were attributed to them at a later age. As both Celtic and Scythian tribes dwelt amongst them, and numerous Greek colonies had founded flourishing cities on the coast, it may be supposed the population of the country was considerably mixed. The kings of the Odrysæ, the most powerful of the Thracian tribes, were already vassals of Rome, until the murder of King Rhæmetalces induced the embodiment of the Odryso-Thracian kingdom into the Roman empire under the emperor Claudius, though it was not till Vespasian that the country was formally organised as a province.

Cities, it appears, there were none as yet in the interior. The Romans had beaten the Bessi, the central people of

Thrace, but only after sanguinary engagements. As, in Strabo's time, they were leading a wretched existence in hovels, and were styled robbers even by robbers,[1] it is quite possible this state of things might have followed only in consequence of their wars with the Romans and financial burdens laid upon them. On the coast of the Propontis lay the old Samian colony Perinthus, which, under the later denomination of Heraclea, became the capital of the province; while, in a most happy situation on the Golden Horn between the Propontis and the Bosphorus, arose Byzantium, as if predestined to be one of the world's capitals. Megarian settlers first founded it, Milesian followed. The Romans had allowed it its own laws and its considerable territory on the coast of Pontus, and made it one of their strongest cities.

Between the Hæmus and the Danube to the north of Thrace, and containing the modern Servia and Bulgaria, lay the province of Mœsia, inhabited by many tribes related to the Thracian stock. It had but little place in the history of the Roman wars, except as a battle-ground; and even its cities, as Singidunum (Belgrade) and Dorostorum, had only a certain importance as headquarters for the legions. And now of those great Thracian families, once so famous and powerful, and so widely spread over the Thraco-Illyrian peninsula and Asia Minor, all that survives is a few inconsiderable remnants of Albanians and Arnauts in Epirus and Macedonia.

The Dacians also and Getæ belonged to the great Thracian family, and in reality formed but one people under different names. Their country, divided from Mœsia by the Danube, included Hungary to the east of the Theiss, Transylvania, the Bukowina, Moldavia to the west of the Pruth, and Wallachia, and in the time of Augustus formed a powerful Geto-Thracian monarchy under its sovereign Byrebistus. This fortunate parvenu by the aid of a stranger, a juggler idolised by the Getæ, had not only subjected and united the whole population, but had also collected together a standing army of two hundred thousand warriors, before which the whole valley of the Danube, from the Pontus to Noricum, prostrated

[1] Strabo, p. 318 (461, Oxf.).

itself in submission.[1] The present Bessarabia and South Moldavia were at that time a wilderness, and called "the waste of the Getæ."[2] The Celtic tribe of the Boii on the Upper Danube, in modern Austria, had, since the year 48 B.C., yielded to the ascendency of the Dacians. However, this great Dacian monarchy fell to pieces on the murder of Byrebistus; and when, later on, the Dacian king Decebalus fell beneath the victorious arms of Trajan, Dacia was converted into a Roman province, and remained so till about the time of Aurelian (275 A.D.).

The policy of the Roman Cæsars, to break down nationalities, at least to pare them away in all points of essential distinction, was accompanied with almost complete success. In east as well as west, the old hereditary national spirit, that kept them together, had disappeared. Putting aside the Germans, who, in their leading races, were not exposed to the Roman systematic processes of assimilation and denationalising, one discovers but two people who withstood these influences, the Jew and, partially, the Egyptian. From the Adriatic Sea to the Ocean, all was ready to become Roman in speech and customs. In the east, however, from the Euphrates as far as to the Adriatic, there was a continued prevalence and extension of Greek usage and the Hellenic tongue: like a mighty stream, penetrating everywhere, Hellenism had overflowed all here. Even in remote Bactria, to the very bank of the Indus, Greek was understood; Greek civilisation and writing maintained their ground into the first century after Christ. Parthian kings had the dramas of Euripides played in their presence: Greek rhetoric and philosophy, the Hellenic passion for public speaking, discussions, and lectures, spread far in Asiatic cities. In the whole circuit of the empire the Greek language was, and continued, the chosen medium for oral and written intercourse amongst the educated; so that, even in Roman-Africa, Appuleius expounded philosophy in Greek. Acquaintance with Latin, on the other hand, was the less common amongst the Greeks and hellenised Orientals, as they all cherished the idea, which Strabo[3] among others expresses,

[1] Strabo, vii. p. 304 (438, Oxf.); xvi. p. 762 (1084, Oxf.).
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 294, 305 (438, 440, Oxf.). [3] *Geogr.* iii. p. 166 (227, 8, Oxf.).

that Roman literature was too unindependent, and that the study of it was but to little purpose, inasmuch as it had borrowed its largest and best part from Greek sources. Hence it has been observed, that from Dionysius to Libanius not a single Greek critic even names Horace or Virgil. Moreover, the notion, that all who had not hellenised themselves in language and manners, and therefore the Romans too, were still at bottom but barbarians, had gained ground everywhere in common with Hellenism, although it was not expressed to their masters in their presence.

On the other hand, the Romans, up to Hadrian's time, were not wanting in endeavours to oblige the eastern nations of the Greek tongue to the reception of the Latin. Governors and magistrates issued their orders, and gave their decisions, only in the official language. They compelled their subjects to hold intercourse with them through interpreters.[1] It was but seldom Roman statesmen condescended to have recourse to Greek in the transaction of business. In the government departments, as well as in the courts of judicature and in the army, Latin prevailed. The emperor Claudius actually deprived a Lycian deputy of high rank of his rights of Roman citizenship on the plea that his ignorance of Latin was disgraceful.[2] By these means their success was such, that Plutarch[3] could assert in general terms, "Almost all mankind speak Latin"; and Pliny could panegyrise his own tongue in high-flown words of praise, as combining in unity the discordant tongues of so many people, and that with this medium of oral communication mankind were being gradually humanised. Meanwhile the old dialects of the country maintained their ground in many lands in the lower strata of society. As late as 230 A.D. a decree of the emperor Alexander takes for granted that the Celtic and Punic were still spoken and written in Gaul and Africa respectively.[4] Care, however, was taken that every intellectual acquisition of the different nations should be turned to common account through the medium of one or other of the two prevalent languages.

[1] Valer. Max. ii. 2. 2.
[2] Suet. *Claud.* xvi.
[3] *Quæst. Plat.* p. 1010; x. 198, Reiske; Plin. *H. N.* iii. 6.
[4] *Dig. Leg.* xxxii. tit. i. 11.

The great emporium for all, the centre, which exercised so powerful an attraction over the educated, the ambitious, the pleasure-seeker, and the greedy of gain of all nations, was, and continued to be, Rome. To her all other cities necessarily looked. Rome was now the epitome of the whole world. Rome in Strabo's time swarmed with scholars from Tarsus and Alexandria. The voice and standard of the Roman public reacted on taste, and gave the intellectual direction in Greece and Asia. The fortunate provincials who were permitted to stay there sent their literary notices of newly issued writings, and reports of speeches and witty sayings of famous persons, to their native homes; papers, *acta*, edited at the imperial court, kept the remotest provinces informed of the daily life and events in Rome, and even of remarkable trials, speeches, and literary news.[1]

Rome did not govern in the heart of her empire with the resources and in the guise of a military or bureaucratic despotism, which is all-controlling, and with a jealous, all-observant eye encroaches upon every department of life. Her moderate army was stationed, for the most part, on the frontiers, in quarters of its own, for protection against external enemies. In the whole of inner Gaul, for instance, there were but 1200 men in garrison; Asia Minor was without a standing force; in most of the cities there were generally no troops. With just pride contemporaries speak of the Roman peace, and praise "its majesty," as Pliny does. They considered their government as the guardian of the world's repose,—a repose which guaranteed the intercourse of all parts of the empire with one another and with Rome, which was facilitated by excellent military roads; but which was fearfully interrupted by sanguinary struggles for the empire, after Nero and Commodus. The helm of government was, on the whole, guided by a strong and steady hand, the pressure of which was but little felt, because there was but little of administrative interference. The idea of watching jealously over subjects was far from the minds of those in power, and the contrary principle of leaving cities and corporations to look after their own interests was ordinarily pursued.

[1] Seneca, *Consol. ad. Helv.* vi.; Dionys. Halic. *de . Oratt. ant.* iii. 20.

II. THE NATIONS AND COUNTRIES OUTSIDE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

BEYOND the boundaries of the Roman empire lay "another world," Armenia, the kingdom of Parthia, India, China, Arabia, Æthiopia, and the Teutonic north,—powers, two of which, the Arabs and Germans, held in their own hands the destinies of east and west, though without their being conscious of it.

Greater Armenia was a country richly blessed by nature, in extent equivalent to about the half of Germany. It is a well-watered mountain-land between the Black and Caspian Seas, having the races of the Caucasus on the north, and Mesopotamia and Assyria on the south. Situated at that time between two great empires, the Roman and the Parthian, dependence on one of which seemed inevitable, while policy required the maintenance of a good understanding with the other, its people were nevertheless enabled to preserve their freedom in the interior, and an unmixed purity of blood, in spite of occasional immigrations. At the same time, it continued to be, even in the following centuries, the arena on which the great powers of east and west fought for the possession of Western Asia and the prey which falls to the conqueror. The ancients had no certain knowledge concerning the descent of the Armenians. The statement of Herodotus, that they descended from the Phrygians, must probably be reversed; and Strabo's fancy of deriving them from the Thessalians appears to originate only in the perception of certain accidental external similarities. They held themselves to be a primitive people, descended from Haïg, one of the Japhetidæ. Their language is akin to the Indo-Germanic family. Their dispersion into many countries, and the spirit of trading thereby awakened, were consequences only of their being conquered at a later period. Armenia became a Roman province under Trajan only transiently. Artaxata, the beautiful and fortified residence of Armenian kings on the Araxes, was burnt by Corbulo in Nero's time. King Tiridates was

allowed to rebuild it, under the title of Neronias. Lucullus had already attempted to ruin Tigranocerta, the artificial half-finished creation of Tigranes, by sending home the colonists there collected, and by demolishing it: yet it reappears again, on the pages of Tacitus,[1] in Nero's time as a strong city. Otherwise Armenia was a strikingly poor country for cities, in proportion to its size.

The ancients had, on the whole, a very deficient acquaintance with the mountain races dwelling in Caucasia, between the Black Sea and the Caspian. The nature of the country, as well as of its people, was incompatible with a complete conquest and a Roman organisation. The people of Colchis, in whom, from many striking resemblances, Herodotus believed he discerned an Egyptian origin, dwelt in the modern Russian provinces of Guriel, Imeretia, and Mingrelia, but were broken up into a multitude of separate tribes, speaking such a variety of tongues, that the Romans, at the Colchian seaport of Dioscurias, otherwise Sebastopolis, were forced to transact business by means of a hundred and thirty interpreters.[2] After the conquest of Mithridates, they had given the country to Polemo; later it was considered as Roman property, particularly after Trajan had built fortresses on the coast: still their power there was limited to the exaction of tribute from a few petty princes.

Iberia, the Georgia of the present day, the fertile mountain-girt plain of the Caucasian isthmus, with an agricultural and peaceful population, living after Armenian and Median fashion, first fell into Roman hands after Trajan. A poor Scythian tribe inhabited Albania, which borders on Iberia on the east, and comprises the modern Schirwan and the southern part of Daghestan. This people, out of indolence, pursued agriculture only in its rudest form, and, notwithstanding the twenty-six dialects spoken amongst them, according to Strabo, were united together under one supreme chief.

The Parthian kingdom had risen from inconsiderable beginnings with the dynasty of the Arsacidæ or Ashcanians, in the year 250 B.C. At the head of a northern wandering horde, and claiming to be of the line of the old Persian kings, Arsaces had made his appearance in Parthia, and

[1] *Annal.* xv. 4. [2] Plin. *H. N.* vi. 10, 11 (vi. 5, ed. Franzius).

profited there by the interior dismemberment and growing weakness of the Syrian kingdom of the Seleucidæ, to lay the foundations of an independent power. By the year 189 B.C. the authority of the Seleucidæ over the Zend races had come to a close. Media and Persia formed again their own national kingdoms. The hitherto insignificant kingdom of the Arsacidæ raised itself, from the date 174 B.C., under Arsaces to a considerable size. The kings of the Persians, Medes, and Elymæans were tributaries; and already, in 145 B.C., the satrapies of Mesopotamia and Babylon had fallen to the Parthians. In the year 130 B.C. their domination over the whole of Western Asia was established. About the beginning of the Christian era, the Median kingdom was destroyed by them; at a somewhat later period the Persian royal dynasty followed. The wars between them and the Romans, which had been conducted with but little advantage for either side, yet not without permanent enfeeblement of the Roman empire, and still more of the Parthian, turned upon the possession of Armenia and the country between the Tigris and Euphrates. In the interior of the kingdom, growing contests for the succession, and revolts of satraps, had occurred already, and showed critical symptoms of decay.

The countries of Mesopotamia, Babylonia, and Assyria, that great district of Western Asia which, bounded on the north by Armenia, on the east by Media and Susiana, on the west by Syria and the Arabian Desert, extends downwards as far as the Persian Gulf, and forms the river-land of the Euphrates and Tigris,—had hitherto constantly shared the same fortunes. First dependencies of the Assyrian, then of the Persian empire, next, after the conquest of Alexander, incorporated for the most part into the kingdom of the Seleucidæ, they were now partly under Roman, partly under Parthian dominion, and formed the vast battlefield and prize for Roman and Parthian combatants. Yet even at that time Adiabene, the plain of the Tigris, and the chief province of Assyria, made a separate kingdom, dependent on the Parthians; and its princes, Monobazus and Izates, with their mother Helena, adopted the Jewish religion in the time of Claudius.[1]

[1] Joseph. *Ant. Jud.* xx. 2-4.

The old Assyrian capital, Ninive on the Tigris, the voluptuous, thoughtless city, which, according to the Hebrew prophet, said in her heart, "I, and no other beside me," had now been in ruins for 600 years. Xenophon found them uninhabited in his expedition through Asia. It must have been later that a new city, Ninus, was built in the neighbourhood by the princes of Adiabene under the Parthian sway; for Tacitus and Ptolemy [1] make mention of it. Assyria appears, however, to have been in a state of extreme depopulation in our Lord's days: Xenophon, in his, found the earlier cities, as those of Mespila and Larissa, already ruined and desolate; and no new ones of any importance are mentioned.

Mesopotamia, lying on this side the Tigris, was better supplied with cities. The Chaboras divided it into the western principality of Osroene, which the chief of an Arab nomad horde had laid the foundations of, about the year 146 B.C., in the time of the decay of the Seleucidæ; and into the eastern one of Mygdonia, styled Anthemusia, the land of flowers, on account of its fertility. The Græco-Syrian capital of Osroene, Edessa, situated exactly on the frontier line of the Roman and Parthian empires, was now the seat of its king Abgarus. It was afterwards destroyed by Trajan's army, but revived and flourished again. Not far from it lay the ancient town Charræ, in a later day colonised by the Macedonians, the Haran of Abraham, where the flower of the Roman army was cut off under Crassus. From that "heathen city," Hellenopolis, as the Syrian Christians subsequently named it, idol worship must have spread itself the whole world over, according to their legends.[2] Nisibis, or at first Antiochia, the former residence of Armenian sovereigns in Mygdonia, where, according to Plutarch's statement,[3] genuine descendants of the Spartans still dwelt, was conquered by Lucullus in spite of the fame of its invincibility. It fell afterwards into Parthian hands, from whom Trajan again tore it. Thenceforward, down to Jovian, it continued to be the outwork of the Roman empire, on which all the attempts of Parthian and Persian were wrecked.

[1] Tacit. *Ann.* xii. 13; Ptolem. vi. tab. 1.
[2] Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* i. 51, 201; ii. 107, 260.
[3] *De Serâ Num. Vind.* xxi.

Babylonia, the southern continuation of Mesopotamia from the point where the Euphrates and Tigris approximate down to the Persian Gulf, the Senaar of the Old Testament, and now a satrapy of the Parthian kingdom, was, on account of its excellent soil, thickly peopled in high antiquity. It was then protected by artificial canalisation against annual inundations, which now make the country a vast surface of water for almost six months of the year, and after subsiding leave behind an incrustation of salt that is destructive of vegetation. Even now the numerous barrows of ruins there visible, and the names of many cities that have disappeared, bear witness to the once flourishing condition of a land that has been brought to desolation through the sluggishness of its last inhabitants and the misrule of its masters. The ancients distinguish the Semitic race of Chaldees who occupied the south-western part of the country on the Euphrates, from the members of the priest caste in Babylonia, commonly called Chaldees, who, in prehistoric times, are said to have come as colonists from Egypt, and now, divided into several schools, with a variety of systems, pursued the study of astronomy.[1]

The oldest of the world cities and glory of the whole earth, the proud beauty of the Chaldees, "the hammer of the universe,"[2] Babylon on the Euphrates, already saw the Divine doom, announced long beforehand, in course of fulfilment. Previously broken down by her destruction under Darius, she received her deathblow from the foundation of new capitals in her vicinity, first Seleucia, and then Ctesiphon. Add to that the two emigrations, in the time of the emperor Claudius, of Jews,[3] who were even then still numerous there. Thus, according to Strabo's account,[4] the city was then for the first time in ruins. The emperor Severus found it completely depopulated; and, as Pausanias tells us, there was nothing but walls to be seen.[5] The four capitals, Seleucia, Ctesiphon, El Madain, and Kufa, which rose there successively, were all built for the most part out of her ruins. And soon the sentence which the prophets had proclaimed was fulfilled to the letter,—that Babel should

[1] Strabo, xvi. 739 (1050, Oxf.); Diodor. i. 28, ii. 29–31.
[2] Jer. l. 23, li. 41; Isa. xiii. 19.
[3] Joseph. *Ant. Jud.* xviii. 9. 8.
[4] Strabo, xvi. p. 738 (1049, Oxf.).
[5] Dio Cass. lxxv. 9; Pausan. viii. 33.

be a heap of stones, and a den of serpents, and that even the Arabs should no more build huts there.[1]

On the other hand, Seleucia on the Tigris, with her 600,000 inhabitants, was then standing in her full bloom. She was the creation of the first Seleucus, a sovereign generally successful in the foundations of his cities. She was peopled by the removal of a large proportion of the inhabitants of Babylon, and the attraction of numbers of Greeks. Rivalling Alexandria as an emporium for Asiatic commerce, she formed a free state, respected and spared by the Parthians, with a Greek constitution; and soon after her foundation became the centre and rallying-point for the history of Western Asia. The remnants of the earlier Greek settlements on the Euphrates and Tigris had also congregated here. Three, or in reality four, nationalities, the Babylonians and Syrians,—Josephus designates both by the latter title,—Greeks and Macedonians, and lastly, Jews, who generally swarmed in Mesopotamia and Babylonia, formed a community often embroiled in quarrels one with another. For instance, in the year 50 B.C., the united Greeks and Syrians determined on a frightful massacre of the detested Jews, of whom about 50,000 lost their lives.[2] Seleucia had a dangerous rival in her neighbour Ctesiphon, lying over against her on the east bank of the Tigris; a large town by Strabo's time, it had served as a winter residence for the Parthian kings, and a place of encampment for their troops; after which it grew rapidly great. There is evidence of the size which it reached, in the fact that, on the conquest of the city by the emperor Severus, and after a terrific massacre, still 100,000 of the survivors were made prisoners.

The inhabitants of Inner Arabia, intrenched behind the impenetrable bulwarks which nature had drawn round their settlements, had remained hitherto without the pale of history. Persians, Macedonians, and Romans had in turn recoiled from before their girdle of desert. The attempt of Ælius Gallus, under Augustus, to penetrate into the country had utterly failed, and was never afterwards renewed. The country, out of which Trajan formed a

[1] Jer. li. 37; Isa. xiii. 19 sqq., xiv. 4, 12.
[2] Joseph. *Ant. Jud.* xviii. 9. 9.

province of Arabia, with Bostra for its capital, did not properly belong to Arabia. Whilst commercial intercourse with the inhabitants of the coast had created an influx of strange customs or rites amongst them, the national character of the Semitic Arab preserved itself in the peninsula all the purer. It was for later centuries to show the astonished world what energy and indomitable spirit dwelt in the sons of Joktan and Ismael under the influences of a new religion. Meanwhile the Romans of the east learnt by experience that diamond only can cut diamond, Arab only can subdue Arab.

To the south of Egypt, amongst the Ethiopians, or negro people of the east of Africa, a primitive, priestly, and commercial state had arisen in Meroe, the large peninsula surrounded by the sources of the Nile, whose rule extended over the whole of North Ethiopia, the modern Nubia. Their capital of the same name lay in the neighbourhood of Schendy, where to the present day the most splendid ruins of temples, sepulchral monuments, and pyramids are visible. Here, at an early period, a higher civilisation had developed itself than was to be found amongst the rest of the Ethiopians; so much so, that, according to Pliny, 4000 artificers were to be found in Meroe.[1] However, from 284 to 246 B.C., King Ergamenes, who was acquainted with Greek civilisation, put an end to the hierarchy there by means of a massacre of the priests, and converted the government of the country into an unlimited monarchy.[2] The kingdom of Meroe seems soon after to have fallen into decay. In the time of Christ, and immediately afterwards, two kingdoms appear there, the northern, or Nubian, having Napata for its capital. Here female sovereignty was in vogue, and the queen always took the name of Candace.[3] Napata was the southernmost point to which the Romans penetrated, when Petronius, their prefect in Egypt, conquered the city, in the year 24 B.C. To the south-east of Meroe, in what is now Abyssinia, perhaps about the same period, the great Auxumitic kingdom, first mentioned by Ptolemy and

[1] *Hist. Nat.* vi. 29, 33 (vi. 35, ed. Franzius).
[2] Diodor. vol. i. pp. 178, 3.
[3] Strabo, p. 820 (1161, Oxf.); Acts viii. 27.

Arrian, grew up, and extended its sway right across to Arabia, over the country of the Homeritæ and Sabæans. The Greek language and civilisation had made its way even here through the medium of the seaport Adule, a foundation of runaway Egyptian slaves not known to Strabo, and also through the brisk trade for which the beautiful capital Axume served as a centre. From 76 to 99 A.D. there was a sovereign here named Zoskales, who was distinguished as a Greek scholar.[1]

The southernmost country of Asia, that between the mountains of Himalaya, the Indus, and the Ocean, from Cashmeer to Cape Comorin, from the embouchure of the Indus to the mountains lying to the east of the Barhampooter, now divided into two parts by the Vindya mountains forming Hindoostan on the north, and the Deccan on the south, was but little known to the ancients before Alexander's time, although they already entertained the idea that it was one of the most important and remarkable countries of the world. It was first thrown open by the victorious expedition of the Macedonians, and then the first attempt was made to render India dependent on the Western world. The early rise and fall of the great Asiatic monarchies, which reached betimes to the western bank of the Indus, seem not to have affected India in fact. Alexander advanced only to the Hyphasis in the Punjaub, and therefore never reached the Indians proper. Somewhat later, the Greek Megasthenes, in his character of ambassador from Seleucus Nicator to the Indian king Sandracottus, spent many years at his court at Palibothra; and from his report, which corresponds in almost all particulars with original Indian documents, the later accounts are principally derived. There was then in existence there the great kingdom of Magadha, called by the Greeks the kingdom of the Prasians, which reached from the Indus in the west to the bay of Bengal and the mouths of the Ganges to the east, and whose capital, Palibothra, now Patna, where the Son flows into the Ganges below Benares, built in the shape of a regular parallelogram, with sixty-four gates, extended two German miles in length; and is a place of fame in the old Indian

[1] *Peripl. Mar. Erythr. ap. Hudson, Geogr. Min.* i. 3.

epic poetry. The sovereign Sandracottus, the Indian Tschandragupta, 312–288 B.C., made an alliance with Seleucus about the year 302, and by conquest raised his kingdom to the acme of greatness and power. And yet the smaller dynasties in the Deccan continued to subsist. This great kingdom came to an end about the year 173 B.C., on the fall of the Maurja dynasty, which ruled 137 years from Tschandragupta.

In Bactria, the modern Balk, the Greek Diodotus, withdrawing himself from his allegiance to Syria, about the year 250 B.C., founded a Bactrian kingdom, which, under its Greek sovereigns, soon extended itself as far as to India. From there Demetrius especially, and after him Menandrus, in the course of their conquests, about the middle of the second century, pushed their conquests further into India than Alexander and the other Greeks. The kingdom of the last-named monarch appears to have extended south as far as Barygaza, now Baroatsch, and east almost to the Ganges. However, no long time afterwards, the Bactro-Grecian dynasty fell, partly beneath the superiority of the Parthian, partly from the invasion of Scythian (Tartar) nomad hordes, advancing into the country from the north: and from the year 126 B.C. there grew up the vast Indo-Scythian empire of the Sacæ, comprising Bactria, Caboolistan, the countries on the Indus, the Punjaub, and a large portion of the present Rajpootana. This kingdom was destroyed in the year 56 B.C. by Vikramaditya, "the mortal foe of the Sacæ"; at least, it was broken up into the Punjaub and the countries lying east of it. This monarch, who seems to have again enlarged the Indian empire to the west as far as the Indus, appears quite in a light of mythical brilliancy, fabulously exaggerated by Indian tradition. The time of his sovereignty, identical with that of the birth of Christ, is said to have been the real date of Indian science and art in its meridian splendour. Rather later, about the year 60 A.D., when the Periplus of the Red Sea was written, a Partho-Indian empire existed that extended at least to Jellalabad, and had nearly the whole extent of the Indo-Scythia of Ptolemy. Shortly before the birth of Christ, an empire founded by the Hue-tchi, one of the

nomad tribes that came from Inner Asia, seems to have taken its place; but as concerns its duration and circuit all is enveloped in mystery. Even the notices furnished by Pliny, and resting, as it appears, on accurate information, throw no light on the existence and character of a great Indian empire. On the other hand, Ptolemy, about the year 140 A.D., was acquainted with a kingdom of Caspiræans, the ruling people of Cashmeer, which extended as far as the Ganges on the east, and very likely had expanded itself east as well as south at the expense of the then considerably limited Indo-Scythian kingdom. To the south of the Ganges, Ptolemy enumerates a series of nations and kings, none of whom seem to have possessed an ascendency, and may rather be considered as having been all independent.

The people of India were connected with the Indo-Germanic race, and in particular with the great Arian family. They were, therefore, near of kin to the Persian Zends in language and pedigree. In prehistoric times they had drawn from the north-west, the Iranian highlands, to the western and southern slopes of the Hindoo Koosch and the Himalayas, whence they spread generally over the whole peninsula. The whole population of black race were partly dispersed amongst the mountains, and partly thrust down to the lowest grade of servitude, as a despised class, whose very touch was contamination. Even Ctesias had already learnt to distinguish between the white and black Hindoos; and remains of such dark and swarthy people have kept their ground on the Indus, in the Himalaya, and the Ganges country. To the Arian, or Sanscrit, people belonged the ruling religion, the powers of government, and the whole civilisation and intellectual direction of India.

The most distinctive feature in Hindoo society, the division into castes, is described by the Greeks[1] in a way which agrees in the more important points with native authorities. By no other people of antiquity was this organisation, which also existed in Egypt, so logically carried out, so consistently, or so strictly. The first order

[1] Strabo, pp. 703–15 (1001, Oxf.); Diodor. ii. 40; Arrian, *Ind.* 11. 12; Porphyr. *de Abstin.* iv. 17. 18.

was composed of the sages; for the Brahmins appeared to the Greeks as philosophers rather than primarily as priests. They were the soul of the body politic, holy and inviolate, the teachers and spiritual guardians of the people, the depositaries of all science, judges and expounders of the laws, soothsayers, physicians, councillors of kings, protectors of religion, and superintendents of sacrifice. One part of them went about teaching; another, living in the forests, took upon themselves the severest and most violent ascetic practices.

Megasthenes was acquainted, in his time, with the religious divisions of the Hindoos. He tells us the sages were divided into two sects: the Brahmins, and Sramins, or tamers of the senses, a name given to the Biksoos, Buddhist ascetics living on alms. These last Clement of Alexandria[1] designates expressly as Buddhists. The Brahmins, however, have always had the great proportion of people in India on their side, even at the time when powerful sovereigns threw all their influence into the scale of Buddhism; and the long struggle at last terminated in the entire expulsion of Buddhism and its followers from the peninsula.

The Greek accounts have increased the true number of Indian castes from four to seven, in this way: they reckon as separate orders what are only subdivisions of the Brahmin and Kshatryas castes. So with the civil functionaries, from whom the kings chose the supreme council, the judges and the commanders in war, and the class of police inspectors, who appear to have formed a large body of secret police, exercising a universal vigilance, and reporting to the sovereign or the magistrates.[2] The caste of the Kshatryas, whom Megasthenes calls the warriors, and with some exaggeration accuses of leading a reckless, jovial, and insubordinate life, was very numerous, particularly in Southern India, but held in less veneration than the Brahmins. The king belonged to their caste. They, as well as the Brahmins, were allowed to pursue other occupations in order to gain a livelihood. The third caste, that of the Vaisjas, was composed of merchants, farmers, and craftsmen. The Sudras reckoned as the fourth, and were

[1] P. 359, Potter. [2] Strabo, pp. 707 sqq. (1005, Oxf.).

descendants of the vanquished aborigines, who are devoted to servitude, and for whom a blind subjection to their masters' will is a religious duty. If the Sudra be not a slave born, then he must serve a Brahmin, or if need be, even a Kshatrya or a Vaisja.

The Greeks observed the dense population of India with astonishment. In their eyes, the good qualities of the nation appeared to be the prominent ones. They praise them for love of truth; and remark, that robbery was extremely rare amongst them, and that their kings spent nearly the whole day in the administration of justice. In the kingdom of Magadha, under the first successors of Tschandragupta, not only was the country flourishing, but gradually violence, theft, and robbery became unknown. The simplicity and temperance of the Indian in eating and drinking struck the followers of Alexander particularly. Suicide was the more frequent amongst them, as they esteemed death but a birth to a real life,[1] and perpetrated the destruction of their own existence like a religious ceremony. Amongst the Cathæans in the north-west of India, and some other tribes also, a custom prevailed that obliged the widow to burn herself along with her husband's corpse, if she would not be looked upon as dishonoured.[2]

Of the hundred and eighteen Indian nations whom Megasthenes enumerated, there were some free races without kings. The settlements of such were chiefly to be found to the east of the Irawaddy, as far as Vipasa. Many lived, too, without Brahmins, and without the exclusive system of castes. On these the Brahmin Indians, even at this day, look down, as "excommunicate" and "recreant," with aversion and contempt.[3] Brahmin views and Brahmin law, meanwhile, continued to make their way further and further into India, and lorded it more and more over the whole social and intellectual life of the people. Flexible and yielding in its system of teaching, yielding to the polytheistic inclination of the people, and to the service of new gods whom this inclination produced, Brahminism clung with greater tenacity to the caste system, and to the

[1] Strabo, p. 715 (1011, Oxf.). [2] Arrian, *Ind.* 10. 2.
[3] Lassen, *Ind. Alterth.* i. 821–823.

ritual and ceremonial part of religion, which continued to grow more and more artificial and intricate.

Just, however, as Brahminism attained its full proportions in India, there arose a powerful opponent to it out of its own bosom. Buddhism upreared itself, four or five centuries before Christ; and taking its stand upon the same speculative foundation as Brahminism, nevertheless developed a completely opposite system. Whilst Brahminism, as compared with its everlastingly reposing and only existing God, considered the actual world only as a thing encumbered with finiteness and negation, and that, too, but a huge delusion and a fleeting dream; the doctrine of Buddha, on the other hand, denied the divine primal being (Brahma) as the cause of the universe (whose course, moving in circle through countless evolutions of worlds, had had no beginning), and represented the subduing of all human misery as the end to be obtained through the greatest possible annihilation of the world and self. For pain and existence, in Buddhist teaching, are inseparable; and as passion only leads to continued propagation, or renewal of being, so the suppression of passion is the way to escape from the renovation of existence, and therewith from pain. Its morale of quietism, and of compassionate sympathy with man and beast, its breaking through the restraints of caste ordinances, while each one of any caste might be received in the class or order of poor Biksoos, renouncers of marriage and family, all won for it the hearts of many amongst the people; and as the system started at first without any cultus, or particular theology, but at the same time seemed to leave scope for the popular divinities and their worship, and for a spirit world; and as it did not, above all, set up to pass for a new religion in opposition to Brahminism, but rather as a mere new philosophical school, like the Greek, and, in such character, only announced a peculiar kind of speculation of its own, with a corresponding moral and ascetic teaching,—it was by these means enabled to extend itself at first with so little resistance. Buddhism made great progress under the Indo-Scythians, and, in the great kingdom of Magadha, the emperor Asoka, Tschandragupta's grandson, formally embraced it, and laboured with such zeal for its extension, and with such

striking success, that all the Buddhist traditions are full of his name. An edict he left behind him, hewn in stone, of the date 236 B.C., mentions an agreement, by force of which two kings of the west, Ptolemy (Euergetes), and his son Magas in Egypt, allowed Buddhist missionaries admission into their territories.[1] Afterwards, however, it came to a struggle for life and death between Brahminism and Buddhism, which lasted centuries in India, and resulted in the complete victory of the former, and with the entire expulsion of Buddhism from the land of its birth.

Grecian influence, the vehicle of which, in the first instance, was the long-protracted sway of Grecian sovereigns in the north-western parts of India, and later the decided and regular commercial intercourse kept up with the eastern countries of the Roman empire, and Alexandria in particular, was considerable in India, but only not upon religion or the institutions of political and social life. On the other hand, Indian architecture, and still more astronomy, the scientific form of which proceeded entirely from translations of Greek works, pointed the more decidedly to Hellenic inspiration. The performance of Greek plays at the court of the Grecian sovereigns appears to have had some share even in the development of the Indian drama.

The island of Taprobane, or Ceylon, from the ignorance of antiquity about its extent, passed for a new world, and one in a high state of cultivation; so much so, that Pliny speaks of five hundred cities as to be found there. The Indo-Brahmin civilisation had already, in the last century before Christ, sunk here under the victorious onslaught of Buddhism. The islands of the Indian archipelago, Java, Borneo, Celebes, and Sumatra, were hardly known to the ancients by name, and they had but a misty idea of them. They were peopled and cultivated by Hindoo races, after the primitive black population had been overpowered.

Of the Indo-Chinese peninsula to the east, inhabited by tribes of Mongol descent, only a very scanty and obscure notice had penetrated into the west. Up to Alexander's time, people still thought that the world came to an end just behind the Ganges. Later information came from

[1] Ritter, *Asia*, ii. 1130; Benfey, *Encycl. of Halle*, ii. §§ 17, 71.

Greek voyagers, that there was a country rich in gold and silver beyond. They gave it the name of Chryse and Argyre, but had no notion whether it was island or continent. Pliny and Mela mention the legend of one having a soil of gold, and the other of silver. Ptolemy was the first to import authentic information, and to give the names of one or two cities.

That gigantic empire of the east, even then the oldest, and, after the Roman, the most populous also, isolated by nature from the west (for on this side it is quite surrounded by lofty mountains covered with snow and glaciers), was only known to the Greeks and Romans under the names of Serica and Sinæ. Yet the authentic history of China reaches back to the ninth, and even to the eleventh, century before Christ; and there flourished here a primitive civilisation that far surpassed the European in antiquity.

In a hundred families, all of one relationship, the original stock of the Chinese, the oldest branch of the great parent family of nations, spread through the back of Asia. After they had descended from the bleak highland in the north-west, and established themselves first in the present Schen-si, they partly assimilated to themselves, and partly extirpated and chased away, the wild barbarian inhabitants met with on the spot, remains of whom are the Miao in the mountains. The barbarians of South China were first subdued about the middle of the third century B.C. In its essential features, the whole system of the Chinese kingdom was complete as many as eleven centuries before the same era. According to its conception, it was predestined and entitled to the worship of the world. Everything under heaven belonged to it; no distinction was made between China and the *orbis terrarum*. As, however, China, considering itself far superior in cultivation and wisdom, looked contemptuously down upon all other nations; and as the character of the Chinese was never warlike,—they professed that the outcast beasts of barbarians were not worth a conquest, which could only be effected by bloodshed. The ideas upon which the social and political life of the Chinese was originally founded were persevered in with unexampled tenacity in spite of internal catastrophes and change of dynasties. Every development and advance, did it but

present the appearance of variation, was repelled or suppressed. All foreign influence was wrecked on the unbending system of no progress; and foreign conquerors themselves soon fell into the Chinese customs and laws, and became assimilated. In this way China, in her self-dependence, in her downright exclusiveness, a world to herself, rather went alongside of the history of the human race than interfered in any active and decisive way in it. But once, in the year 94 A.D., Pan-tschao, the Chinese commander, penetrated as far as the Caspian Sea, in a war against the Turkish tribes.

The princes of the house of Tsin, about the third century B.C., had crushed the power of the subordinate sovereigns; and dispossessing the dynasty of Tscheu, invested themselves with the imperial dignity. The strongest and most violent monarch of this new dynasty, Schi-hoang-ti (246–209 B.C.), the builder of the great wall, under whom the half of the present area of China was brought into one, undertook not only to reform the whole of the political structure of the empire from its foundation, and to erect in its stead an unlimited uniform monarchy, administered by removable functionaries, but also determined to sweep away the spiritual influence that was an obstacle in his path. This was the doctrine and sect of Confucius. The ethics of this great national teacher, so implicitly reverenced in China, who had chosen the old imperial system for the basis of his doctrines, were of a political nature, and a kind of art of government received like a religion. His numerous scholars, the lettered, were zealous encomiasts of the old state of things, and bitter opponents of the new imperial measures. Then the monarch commanded, under pain of death, all the literary memorials of antiquity, and particularly the Schu-king of Confucius, to be committed to the flames, and had four hundred and sixty of the lettered buried alive. After his death, however, the whole house of Tsin was extirpated. A man of mean extraction became the founder of a new dynasty, the Han dynasty (206 B.C. to 263 A.D.); and the Confucian doctrine raised itself again to a pre-eminence which was thenceforward undisputed. Its founder had not reformed, but only confirmed the old religion of the empire and state.

In this religion, the spirit of heaven, with that of the earth, and that of the human race, composed a divine trinity; but the elements, and the stars, mountains, seas, rivers, and winds, were also conjointly honoured. In general, the Schin, the indwelling spirit in the being of nature, served as the object of worship.[1] It was a religion without priests, without temples, and without festivals. The emperor alone was priest, and offered sacrifice to the celestial spirit; and what chiefly remained as essential was a worship of the dead, through which ancestors, and especially those of the emperors and Confucius, were honoured as divine guardian spirits.

Now that the emperor was the only priest, he also was in possession of all the authority that follows from religion, without its being tempered or limited by the power of church or priesthood. Thus he was, in fact, as very "son of heaven," surrounded with divine honours, and the homage paid him partook of the character of religious adoration. Besides, in a country where the respect and obedience of the child to the parent is a traditional doctrine and the first of all virtues, in fact the beginning of all moral relations, he became the common father of the whole people, the gerent of the highest fatherly patriarchal authority, under which, as all ought to be equal in unconditional submission, like children of one family, no political organisation, no nobility or hereditary rank, can find place. That authority of the men of letters and the officials, by which the imperial omnipotence was not really limited and curbed, but only conducted in a regulated course, and attached to the formalities of an intricate etiquette, only reached its accomplishment much later, about the seventh century after Christ, after long struggles and vicissitudes.

In consequence of the meagre character of the religion of the empire, which afforded no food either to the imagination or the intellectual faculties of men, and left the heart empty and dissatisfied, the rulers were unable, with all their exclusiveness, to prevent the influx of foreign teaching from abroad. Not only did the Tao school, a gloomy and enervate form of Brahminism, find its way at an early

[1] Grosier, *Descript. de la Chine*, iv. 368.

period from India into China, but the doctrines of Fo, or Buddha, also penetrated thither, thirty-three years after the beginning of Christianity, and soon became completely domesticated, in spite of the resistance offered by the disciples of Confucius to the new religion, which they stigmatised as a pernicious superstition.

In the year 57 B.C., the Dairi, or sovereign of Japan, of his own accord sent an embassy to offer homage and presents to the Chinese emperors. The constant intercourse then begun between the two kingdoms was followed by Chinese settlements there, and along with them, by the introduction of Chinese civilisation and regulations into barbarian Japan.

In the centre of Europe, between the Rhine, from the Lake of Constance to its mouth, and the Danube, from its source to where it receives the waters of the Theiss; northwards up as far as the coasts of the North and Baltic Seas, from the mouth of the Rhine to that of the Dwina; in the east to the Vistula, and thence southwards into the vast plain country as far as the Black and Caspian Seas,—the German people, as they were called, had their settlements. They were a motley reunion of races and people, resembling one another in bodily frame, character, language, and customs, and yet not united by any external bond. And thus they could only be called one people in so far as they had all the consciousness of a common nationality, and presented the impression of the same to the view of a stranger, in spite of all their divisions, and the bloody wars they had carried on amongst one another. Germany extended further to the north then than now, for Jutland had a German population; but it was more confined on the west and south, for the whole left bank of the Rhine belonged to Gaul, notwithstanding its inhabitants were partially German, while the country between the Danube and the Alps had a Celtic population, and formed Roman provinces. But in the east, from the Vistula as far as the Black and Caspian Seas, German races were settled amongst Finnish, Tartar, and Slave tribes, and in part mixed with them. The land, covered with vast forests and marshes, and with a climate more raw still than now, was considered inhospitable and gloomy by the Romans; and

being still destitute of cities, only here and there open villages, like towns, were to be seen, and a number of isolated farms.

It was a long time before the Romans learned to distinguish the German people from the Celtic, whom they even afterwards appeared to them strongly to resemble. Strabo himself thought[1] that the Germans, besides resembling the Celts in mind, customs, and modes of life, surpassed them in ferocity, size, and yellow-hairedness. Tacitus held the name of Germani to be the appellation of a single tribe (afterwards called the Tungri) extended to all the German tribes in general. Attempts have also been made to explain it from the Celtic, the Persian, and from the Latin signification, as "brothers," *i.e.* to the Gauls. The Germans themselves appear not to have used it originally, but to have adopted it from the Romans or the Gauls.

Following old native traditions, the Germans were divided into three great races—the Ingævones, Istævones, and Herminones—who derive themselves from the three so-named sons of Mannus, a common ancestor of divine descent. At the time, however, that the Romans and Germans became acquainted, these three great divisions of the nation displayed a host of separate tribes and small district communities. Each one of these went his own way, without troubling himself about his neighbour, until a number of them banded together in a confederation on behalf of a joint enterprise or warlike defence, or by subjection beneath a stronger power. At the head of such a confederacy, or war republic, a race that had become powerful took its position; and this bestowed its name on the vanquished tribes, or any that joined of their own accord, until it again, after the dissolution of the confederacy, or other loss of its power, was swallowed up in the name of another tribe that had waxed into importance meanwhile. It was thus that the confederacies of the Suevi, Marcomanni, and Alemanni, on the Upper Rhine, and those of Sygambri, Cherusci, and Franks, on the Lower, became successively prominent.

The Suevi were settled in the modern Moravia and

[1] Strabo, vii. 290 (418, Oxf.); iv. 195, 196 (273, Oxf.).

Bohemia, Franconia and Thuringia, Lower Saxony and Brandenburg, and the greater part of Poland. The central people were the Semnones, between the Elbe and the Oder, on the Elster and Spree. To them belonged the Longobardi on the Lower Elbe, south of Hamburg towards Salzwedel. To the north of them again were the Angli; then the Chatti in Hesse; the Hermunduri from the valley of the Werra, as far as the Elbe to the east, and the Sudeti in the north; the Marcomanni, who made themselves masters of Bohemia, just after the subjugation or expulsion of the Celtic Boii; and the Quadi, who about the same time had settled in the present Moravia and the north-western part of Hungary. Just at the beginning of the Christian era, the Marcoman prince Maroboduus, who had received a Roman education, made the attempt to form these people into one great Suevic kingdom. This kingdom, or confederation, whose centre was the recently conquered Bohemia, and the town Marobudum, adjoining the present Budweis, appears to have reached from the Middle Danube to the Lower Elbe, and eastward as far as the Vistula; and the Romans understood the danger which threatened them from that quarter.

Contemporary with this, another confederation took its rise in north-western Germany, directly pointed against the Roman domination, the centre of which was composed of the Cherusci on the Weser, under their duke Herminius. There took part in it the Bructeri, who were established between the Rhine and Weser, as far as the sea; the once very powerful Sygambri between the Sieg and the Lippe; the Marsi in the environs of Munster and Hamm, and other tribes. At their hands Varus and his three legions met with total destruction in the Saltus Teutoburgensis, 9 A.D.; and with it the fruits of a twenty years' struggle were utterly lost to the Romans, who were obliged to evacuate entirely the German soil beyond the Rhine. However, the two great confederacies, and their leaders Arminius and Maroboduus, soon after fell out and joined battle. The latter, banished and proscribed by his own people, fled into the Roman territory. Not long after, Arminius himself was murdered by people of his own tribe, the two confederacies fell to pieces, and the Romans

succeeded in keeping the German tribes on the Lower Rhine in dependence, though the emperor Claudius withdrew all the Roman troops from free Germany.

As the Germans of the races in alliance with Rome were glad to enter into its military service, and were enrolled by the Romans in their legions without hesitation, on the strength of their physical and moral qualifications, it soon fell out, in the struggle between Otho and Vitellius, that the imperial throne seemed, for the moment at least, at the disposal of the victorious German legions in full march towards Rome. In the beginning of the second century A.D., too, the keen eye of a Roman discovered in this people the germ of a new life that only required development, the elements of another state of things in the world. The wish he uttered that the variance and discord which belonged to this nation might never cease amongst them, inasmuch as their union would threaten the existence of the whole Roman empire,[1] shows what a conception he had formed of the energy latent in the heart of the German race.

At their first appearance in history, the Germans show as a half-nomadic race in transition from an unsettled life to one of fixed settlement. They were easily inclined, and soon ready, to leave their homes, particularly in a southern direction, to win themselves there a milder climate and more genial soil; not from a restless disposition and the mere pleasure of moving, but with a real desire to reach again a fixed domicile. True, they had, in the time of Tacitus,[2] houses securely built, and agriculture; and they were distinguished thereby from the Sarmatian tribes, who only lived on horseback and in waggons. Still, they cherished a dislike for walled towns; their houses, in truth, were only huts built of wood. Individuals amongst them were not allowed to erect more commodious dwellings, in order to guard against effeminacy,[3] and to leave no impediment in the way of migration.

Their great distinction was the sacredness of marriage, and the consequent consideration and respect for women. "The Germans are almost the only barbarians who content themselves with one wife;" in many tribes the widows even

[1] Tacit. *Germ.* xxxiii. [2] *Ibid.* xlvi. [3] Cæs. *B. G.* vi. 22.

could not marry again.[1] Continency among young men and late wedlock were in high repute; unnatural lust was punished with death. With a corporate division into priests, nobles, free, freedmen, and slaves, they only allowed the possessors of landed property a vote in the municipal councils. Their district princes were elective. The priests were extremely powerful and influential; their power even over life and death was greater than that of their princes. Drunkenness and rude brawling in that state, and rage for play, to the degree of staking their freedom, were the most prominent vices of the Germans.

Beyond the German settlements in a north-east direction, in the Russia of the present day, and the north-eastern part of Gallicia, and those parts of Prussia and Poland which lie to the east of the Vistula, and to the south again, as far down as to the Mæotis and Tanais (Don), stretched the lands which the ancients now called Sarmatia. Where at an earlier period the Scythians are spoken of, the name of Sarmatians was now in vogue, though for a long time both denominations were fluctuating, and used as synonymous. The real Sarmatians came from Medo-Persia, and were allied to the Parthians. Their chief seat was in the steppes beyond the Don, between the Mæotis, and Caucasus, and the Caspian Sea. The smaller tribes of the Roxolani, Jazyges, Alani, and Jaxamatæ belonged to them. Gradually pressed forward from their settlements between the Don and Dnieper as far as the Dneister and Danube, the Sarmatæ just now began to disturb the Roman territory by constant inroads. About the year 50 B.C. they had burst into Hungary between the Theiss and Danube. A victory of Asinius Gallus over them in the year 15 B.C. is mentioned. They were wild, untamed nomads, living on their horses and in waggons, so warlike that even their wives fought alongside of them; but they were better qualified for predatory irruptions than regular warfare.[2] Their descendants are living to this day in the Caucasus, as Alani.

The Slave tribes, under the names of Wends and Serbs, settled in the countries between the Baltic and Black Seas,

[1] Tac. *Germ.* xviii. 19.

[2] *Ibid.* xlvi.; Mela, iii. 4; Amm. Marcell. xvii. 12, 23.

the Carpathians, the Don, and Upper Volga. Though in part dispossessed, and in part subjugated, by the Sarmatians, they were also in a degree independent of their neighbours who surrounded them; no one then thought of them as destined to play a great part in the world's history at a later day. The Greeks and Romans knew nothing of them. Pliny is the first to mention the Wends behind the Carpathians. Next Tacitus, who is not clear on the question of their nationality, whether it was Sarmatian or German; and thought he must acknowledge them as Germans for no other reason than that, unlike the Sarmatians, they built houses, bore shields, and were distinguished for their swiftness of foot. They were not remarkable for a warlike disposition, it appears, and were more attached to the peaceful occupations of agriculture and a domestic life. The Finns were already at that time driven into the extreme north of Europe, on the Gulf of Finland and the Upper Volga. Lastly, the Lithuanian race, in all probability an offshoot from the Slavic in prehistoric times, through admixture with strange tribes, early fell under the dominion of the German people. It was already settled, though small and weak, at the beginning of the Christian era, in the countries of which its successors, the Prussians, Lithuanians, Courlanders, and Letts, were afterwards masters.

BOOK II

THE GREEK RELIGION

I. The Beginnings of Greek Polytheism

The deification of nature and her powers, or of particular sensible objects, lay at the root of all the heathen religions as they existed from old time amongst the nations now united under the Roman empire. The elements, the sun, the heavens, the stars, single natural objects and physical phenomena,—it was the deifying and worshipping of these that led to the rise and development of polytheism. When once a dark cloud stole over man's original consciousness of the Divinity, and, in consequence of his own guilt, an estrangement of the creature from the one living God took place, man, as under the overpowering sway of sense and sensual lust, proportionally weakened therefore in his moral freedom, was unable any longer to conceive of the Divinity as a pure, spiritual, supernatural, and infinite being, distinct from the world, and exalted above it. And then it followed inevitably that, with his intellectual horizon bounded and confined within the limits of nature, he should seek to satisfy the inborn necessity of an acknowledgment and reverence of the Divinity by the deification of material nature; for, even in its obscuration, the idea of the Deity, no longer recognised indeed, but still felt and perceived, continued powerful; and, in conjunction with it, the truth struck home, that the Divinity manifested itself in nature as ever present and in operation. And now nature unfolded herself to man's sense as a boundless demesne, wherein was confined an unfathomable plenitude of powers, incommensur-

able and incalculable, and of energies not to be overcome. Everywhere, even where men, past their first impressions of sense, had already penetrated deeper into their inner life, she encountered them as an inscrutable mystery. At the same time, however, a sympathy for naturalism, easily elevated into a passion, developed itself among them,—a feeling in common with it and after it,—which led again to a sacrifice of themselves, all the more readily made, to natural powers and natural impulses. And thus man, deeper and deeper in the spells of his enchantress, and drawn downwards by their weight, had his moral consciousness overcast in proportion, and gave the fuller rein to impulses which were merely physical.

Necessarily the heathen deification of nature could become nothing but an inexhaustible variety of divinities and worships; for according to the geographical division of zones and countries, and to the difference of the impressions which the phenomena and powers of nature produced on races more or less susceptible and excitable; and also according as the imagination of man, selecting out of the kingdom of nature that which most strongly impressed it, fashioned it into a concrete divinity,—necessarily, as time ran on, in the natural process of the impulse of creating divinities, the divine assumed in their minds thousands of fanciful and fortuitous images and forms. In general, all the gods must inevitably have been beings subject to the conditions of time and space, and, for the most part, to the powers of nature. Then, following the character and degree of civilisation of the different people, these gods of nature were formed on a sliding scale from simple potentiality, regarded as a bare development of physical agency, to individual personality; or they were contemplated as real, self-conscious, and complete personalities. In the latter case they were also, in the conception of their worshippers, partially subject to the conditions of humanity, and shared in the inclinations, passions, and interests of men, from whom they were only distinct in degree.

This pagan deification of the powers of nature led first to the worship of the elements. One divinity of the ether, or vault of heaven, or, supposing the ether and stars together to constitute a whole, one divinity of the heavens,

stood in contrast with one of the earth. Fire, as the warming and nourishing power of nature, or as the consuming and destroying one also, was early worshipped as a separate divinity. By the same process, another element of moisture and water was separated off from that of the earth, and thus a fourth elemental god came to be added.

In the East, where the stars shine brightly in an ever-cloudless sky, and men more readily receive the influences of these heavenly bodies, astrolatry, or the worship of the stars that illumine the earth, developed itself. Above all, it was the sun, the great quickener of nature, adored as the centre and lordly power of the visible universe, as the common source of light and life, by which men felt themselves irresistibly attracted. For their high, ever-increasing susceptibility of natural impressions, and of the properties of the universe, led men to give themselves up with longing and passion to the sidereal powers, and they felt themselves governed by them as if by magic. The cultus they rendered them, the direction of all their intellectual powers towards them, the sympathy with their phases, their setting, disappearances and reappearances, the everywhere prevalent notion in all antiquity that the heavenly bodies were not dead masses of fire or earth, but living animated beings, —all this involved them more and more in a service of complete idolatry and worship. Religion became astrolatry.

But where the influences of the heavens and heavenly bodies were less sensible, where man was surrounded by luxuriant vegetation and the magnificence of a richly furnished soil, attracted by the life of terrestrial nature, he addressed himself to it with all his senses and inclinations; and here geolatry took its rise. The earth, with her teeming lap, like a nursing mother, comprehending in herself a manifold variety of beneficent influences, but also gathering every living thing again to her bosom, came to be worshipped as the great divinity; and from the deification of particular powers of the earthly and natural, a coherent polytheism was formed. The observation of the fact that in nature everywhere two energies or substantial agents, one an active and generative, the other a feminine passive or susceptible one, combine, and that heaven and earth, sun

and moon, day and night, co-operate to the production of being,—the observation of this led to the distinction of male and female divinities. At first the divinity had been conceived as a being uniting the nature of both sexes. Now the female being was severed from the male divinity, and subordinated to it. The goddess of earth, impregnated in holy espousals by the heaven-god, brings forth her fruits. Even the streams, on which the fertility of the soil and the provision of men who live beside them depends, now became personal divinities.

The Greek religion was the result of the peculiar development and history of the Grecian people. Sprung from or grown out of the mixture of races markedly distinct, and situated on the limits of east and west, this people partook chiefly indeed of the Western character, but by its colonies, by frequent immigrations fluctuating hither and thither between Asia Anterior and Hellas, and by active intercourse, received Asiatic habits into its popular life, Asiatic and Egyptian religious ideas and services into its intellectual consciousness. Leleges and Carians, Thracians and Pelasgi, appear in pre-Hellenic times as the representatives of the particular ingredients from the blending and consolidation of which the religious system of the Greeks was formed.

The Leleges were an extremely ancient people, dwelling on the Asiatic coasts, as well as the Græco-European, whose descent was unknown to the ancients; they spread over almost the whole of central Greece and the islands of the Archipelago. Along with them appear the Carians, a seafaring folk akin to the Lydians and Mysians, who settled in the Cyclades and on the seaboard of the Greek continent (Attica and Megara). Later on, both races blended with the Hellenes. The Thracians had the largest share in the early religious cultivation of Greece, and in the beginnings of its civilisation. This was a people, originally related to the Phrygian stock, that dwelt not only in Macedonia and a part of Thessaly, but also in Phocis and Bœotia, extending even as far as to Attica, whilst many other less civilised tribes of this great people stretched far into the mountainous north. Religious poetry and music, the worship of the Muses, the rites and mysteries of Demeter, and, according

to the testimony of Herodotus, the gods Hermes, Ares, Dionysos, and Artemis, also originated amongst them. The indefinite title of Pelasgi too, like that of Frank and Saxon, comprehends a number of tribes of the original Greek stock, who, previous to the rise of the Hellenes in the Peloponnesus, had spread into Attica, Bœotia, Epirus, Thesprotia, and a portion of Thessaly. Their chief seats were Arcadia, Argolis, and Perrhæbia.

According to Herodotus, the Pelasgi, who already possessed the oracle of Dodona, the central point of their cultus, worshipped nameless divinities, supposed ghostlike powers of the universe, from whom all the ordering of the world proceeded, which without doubt they distinguished by particular words, as earth, heaven, sun, etc., but which did not pass with them as having human form with an individual distinct personality. Thus they had no names of their own specially appropriated to them, which would have conveyed the impression of anthropomorphic personality. This is the reason neither image of God in human shape, nor temple, is found amongst them, and why, till the latest times, the Pelasgic Arcadians and Bœotians held several gods to be Autochthones,—born and brought up in the land. Zeus, Hera, Poseidon, Hermes, and Athene were, they say, born in Arcadia. There Pan was indebted to Sinoe, Zeus to the nymphs of Lycæum, for his rearing and nourishment. In like manner the Bœotians asserted that Hermes came into existence amongst them, that the events of the story of Cronos and Rhea happened in their country, and that there also Athene was educated.[1] In this there is a consciousness betrayed that these gods and their worship were not imported from without, and that they were the ancient product of the race, first, as formless powers of nature, and then treated as humanised individuals and persons. The rude idols which in later times received divine honours are memorials of this oldest Pelasgic worship. Hera was worshipped in Samos and Thespiæ under the form of a plank; Athene of Lindus as a smooth, unwrought beam; the Pallas of Attic as a rough stake, and the Icarian Artemis as a log; Zeus Meilichios, at Sicyon, had a pyramidal form; Zeus Casius was a rock;

[1] Pausan. viii. 8. 2, 36. 2, 16, 26. 4, ix. 25. 1.

Apollo Aguieus had the shape of an isosceles triangle; the idols of the Charites of Orchomenos were rough stones that had fallen from heaven; and Hermes exhibited himself as a phallus. Herodotus proceeds to inform us, the Pelasgi first learned the names "and attributes of the gods from foreigners, particularly from the Egyptians" (we may add the Phenicians and other Asiatics), and then, under the authority of the oracle at Dodona, adopted them as their own, and so handed them down to the Hellenes; and one can easily believe that intercourse with strangers, who had made greater advances in the attribution of forms to their gods, and in personification of nature, should have resulted in maturing analogous ideas of their own gods among the Pelasgi, and the formation of their nomenclature.

In the early prehistoric period there were, as it appears, two principal deities,—a god of the heavens, and a god of the earth, the one male, the other female,—to the worship of whom the Pelasgi were specially devoted. The Pelasgic Zeus, not only the son of Cronos and grandson of Uranos, but the primitive god who had always been there, according to the invocation in use at Dodona,[1] to whom the summits of the mountains were generally consecrated, and to whom worship on heights and mountains was most grateful, was a god of the atmosphere, with the symbols of lightning, and the oak, who sent the quickening and fructifying rain. In his sanctuary at Dodona he manifested himself in the branches of the oak sacred to him, by the rustling of the wind in the top of the tree, which the priests, the Tomuri (afterwards called Selli), had to interpret on Mount Lycæus, the highest peak of Arcadia. Lycaon, the son of Pelasgus, the most ancient king of the land, had erected an altar to Zeus, with two pillars bearing eagles, which was consecrated by the sacrifice of a child. On this altar, even up to the times of Pausanias, sacrifice was offered in mysterious fashion, that is, with mystical rites that brought up awakening recollections of the old human sacrifice.[2] At Argos there long stood a three-eyed Zeus,—a carved image, having the third eye in the forehead, and symbolising

[1] Pausan. x. 12. 5.

[2] *Ibid.* viii. 38. 7.

the pre-Hellenic combination in one god[1] of the three kingdoms of the universe, afterwards divided among three.

The worship of a superior and primal female deity was of like antiquity with that of the male: Gaia appears also in the later theogonies as mother of all living, and her hereditary Pelasgic worship was maintained in Athens, Sparta, Patræ, Olympia, and Delphi. She was one of the nameless and imageless Pelasgian divinities, perhaps the oldest, as, in fact, both in Æschylus and Sophocles, Zeus himself is styled her son.[2] In Phlius she was designated the great goddess. At Delphi and Olympia she had her earth oracle. In Gaion, near Ægæ, her priestess was forced to drink bull's blood for her probation. At Dodona she was called Dione, and it was only in later times she was regarded as the consort of Zeus. This goddess of nature, or earth, was conceived to be and reverenced as the mighty mother, who had borne the gods themselves and all creatures in her womb—given them birth, the female factor of natural life. She was connected with Zeus, sometimes as wife, sometimes as mother; and earth, air, and moon, all three female powers, conceiving and bringing forth, as contrasted with the male and generative heaven, ether, and sun, were here blended into the one idea of a common motherly and primal divinity. It was this same mother of the gods who appeared as Rhea in the Cretan traditions, as the Cybele of Asia Anterior in the square stone at Pessinus, as the old moon-and-earth goddess Hera of the Pelasgi in Arcadia and Argos, and at Samos, where, originally a shapeless mass of wood, she was afterwards transformed into a human shape; lastly, she is the Oriental goddess of nature, Aphrodite Urania, who was represented in the gardens at Athens on the old square Pelasgic figure of Hermes.

The male principle of generation, which, under the form of a phallus, serpent, or ram, accompanied the mother of the gods, was after a time dispossessed by Zeus, or developed itself as the nameless Pelasgic demon from the phallus, the symbol of nature's procreating power, into the regular personal form of Hermes, the god of

[1] Pausan. ii. 24. 4.

[2] Æsch. *Suppl.* 901; Soph. *Phil.* 392.

fructification and natural increase. The old figures of this god were rude masses of stone, or what were called Hermæ, that is, pillars having a bearded head and a phallus. Of such Ἑρμαῖαι, or Hermæ-heaps and square forms of Hermes, the Pelasgian Arcadia was fullest of all countries. In Cyllene, the harbour town of Elis, however, this god was still honoured under the form of a simple phallus.[1]

Of the same high antiquity, or nearly, was the worship of the sun, or Helios, in whom, as in Gaia, we still recognise in later times one of the nameless divinities of the Pelasgi; for even up to the time of Pausanias we find him in many places, and particularly where the Pelasgian system of gods and rites was preserved in its purity, worshipped as the sun simply, and not, as happened elsewhere, confounded with Apollo, or absorbed in his worship and titles. In Elis he was placed next Selene, and had an image of marble with a head encircled by rays. He had also statues in his honour near Thalamæ in Messenia, and at Megalopolis, in the temple of Aphrodite; while elsewhere, as at Corinth in the Acropolis there, at Argos in Mantinea, and Trœzen, he had only altars, as the god originally without an image, whose ever-visible manifestation of himself required representing by symbol or figure less than the great elemental divinities.

In the course of a still more remote development, separate powers and phenomena of nature assumed the form of divinities to the minds of Greeks of the pre-Hellenic period; and these, probably at a much later day, were attributed, in the theogony, to the first pair of gods. There is evidence of a very ancient deity of fire, with a service corresponding, in Hestia, whom Hesiod, following the Cretan legend, makes out to be the oldest and ever-virgin child of Cronos and Rhea. As having the care of the hearth and altar fires, she became the protectress of the hearth and of the domestic life connected with it. To her honour, a fire that was never extinguished burnt on many a municipal hearth in the Greek cities. Long represented only by the hearth-stone and its flames, she did not pass readily into a concrete personality, had no

[1] Pausan. vi. 21. 5, viii. 31. 4, iii. 26. 1, ii. 18. 3.

mythical history attached to her, and representations of her appear to have been found only at Athens and Tenedos, we may add also, Naucratis in Egypt; and so but a few temples were erected to her, and hardly any particular festivals were solemnised in her honour, though she was the first to be invoked in the sacrifices, and the first sacrifice was offered to her.[1]

Then followed the worship of the nether world, or the powers under the earth. Domesticated in Greece from the remotest antiquity, it is principally found in neighbourhoods which are considered to have been the special settlements of pre-Hellenic races. Hades, the god of the world below, was not then what he became much later, dispenser of blessings on the corn and on the field; he was not called Pluto, a name which originated with the tragic poets; but he was the dread Aïdoneus, the king of the realm of shadows, the dark, inexorable, mighty lord, whom as yet no effigy portrayed. His worship appears to have died out in various places where it existed in earlier times; so that it might be asserted that this god was only honoured in Pylos and Elis.[2] The goddess paired off with him was not Coré (*Κόρη*), the lovely "daughter" of Demeter, the goddess of agriculture, but Persephone, according to the original signification of her name, the murderess, the fearful death-goddess, the destroyer of all living, also styled by Homer "the Dread." Demeter, too, was worshipped in Arcadia, in a cavern at Phigaleia, as a gloomy, hostile goddess, in black raiment and with serpent-hair; and at Thelpusa as Demeter Erinnys. Later on, again, her cultus as a lower-world goddess, it appears, was hellenised in Pelasgic neighbourhoods through the influence of the Eleusinian mysteries, and Demeter metamorphosed into a philanthropic goddess; while Persephone, from a deity originally motherless, or, if we follow the other tradition, a daughter of Styx,[3] became the Coré, or daughter of Demeter, and so, the child of a heavenly mother, and even a goddess sprung of the bright upper firmament, or heaven; and

[1] Pind. *Nem.* xi. 1 sqq.; Hom. *Hym.* 29; Pausan. i. 18. 3, ii. 35. 2, viii. 9. 2.

[2] Eustath. 744. 5.

[3] Apollod. i. 31.

hence the numerous sanctuaries erected to the Eleusinian Demeter in Arcadia.[1]

Further, to the pre-Hellenic times belongs the worship of the Cabiri, *i.e.* great and mighty gods, the supreme powers of nature, who also were certainly adored at first without specific names. This worship was probably of Phenician origin, introduced into Thebes by the Phenician family of the Cadmeans, and established in the island of Samothracia by Tyrrhenian Pelasgi, who had mixed with the Cadmeans. Axieros, the mother-goddess, the creatrix, who occupied the first place in that island, was afterwards, in Greek fashion, identified with Demeter, Rhea, or Cybele. The pair of nether-world divinities connected with her, and called Axiokersos and Axiokersa, according to the interpretation of Mnaseas,[2] were nothing else but Hades and Persephone, or Dionysos and Coré. Other accounts add a fourth deity to these, Hermes Cadmilus, who, as the family god of the Tyrrhenian Pelasgi, was first thrown in with the original triad, probably in consequence of a settlement of this people in Samothrace; Varro, however, thinks only as an attendant on the greater divinities.[3] On the other hand, in the volcanic island Lemnos, and in conformity with the fire-worship there, the Cabiric union consisted of the pair of deities Hephæstos and Cabiro, and their three sons, who, as offshoots of the fire-god, became the guardian divinities of the blacksmith's craft.[4]

II. The Hellenic Gods, Demons, and Heroes

In consequence of the great tide of movement and the immigrations proceeding from the north during a space of six centuries, one of which, that of the Doric and Ætolian races in 1104 B.C., was very fertile in results, and by reason also of the progress made in the establishment of colonial cities since the beginning of the eleventh century B.C., the whole *status* of possession amongst the Hellenic races was unsettled, the old population was almost entirely removed

[1] Pausan. viii. 14. 8, xxv. 2, xxix. 4, xxix. 31, etc.
[2] Schol. *Paris. Apoll. Rhod.* i. 917. [3] Ling. *Lat.* vii. 88, ed. Spengel.
[4] Strabo, p. 472 (689, Oxf.).

or expelled from its earlier settlements, and a new order of things was constituted. The Pelasgi succumbed, and, except in Arcadia, could only maintain their ground in a few places, where they fused with their conquerors, the new adventurers. The rough warlike races of the north had the upper hand. In the numerous emigrations of particular fragments of Hellenic tribes, distant settlements were formed in the islands of the Mediterranean, on the coasts of Asia and Africa, and in Italy and Gaul. The Hellenic tongue, civilisation, and worship were now extended to a circle embracing the countries round the Black and Mediterranean Seas.

From these migrations, blendings of races, and political innovations, the Hellenic religion sprang up, and remained unchanged in essentials until its decay. As families grew into tribes, and peoples, and civil communities, the religious rites, at first confined to families, were also extended to public rites common to entire polities and races. The newly settled races brought along with them their own gods and ritual; others they found already on the spot, which, whilst at times they treated with neglect or set aside, they more frequently appropriated. To these are to be added forms of worship introduced from foreign countries by a particular house or lineage. The religious rites in the colonies were fashioned after those of the mother-country, but did not disdain the reception into the system of such as were met with already in possession of their new territory. In general, these divinities and their several rites agreed very well together; as, in fact, none had any such exclusive character or distinctly marked features as utterly to reject all accommodation, or insertion into a strange circle. One god sat down by another in an easy unconstrained manner, or rather, from this juxtaposition they first derived reciprocally a more precise form or more limited and clearly defined character. It often happened, too, that the same idea of a divinity was honoured under different titles, when a new deity, that had originated elsewhere, was joined on to an old domesticated one of a like signification in principle, in which case Greek imagination and inventive powers were equal to the providing of each with his distinct characteristics and sphere of operation.

Thus the Greeks entered on the historical period with

an established religious system, or train of gods, in the composition of which all the more important races of Greece, or such as had once settled therein, had borne a part, and to which each had contributed its quota: the Pelasgi; the old race of the Minyæ; the Pierian and Bœotian Thracians, who had bards of fame even before Homer's time; the Leleges and Carians; the Dardanians and Teucrians, the former in Arcadia, the latter in Attica; then the Tyrrhenian Pelasgi, from the northern islands of the Ægean, in Attica and Argos; the Phenician Cadmeans, and as well the people of Bœotian Arne, who conquered or expelled them; and, finally, the Achæans, Ionians, and Dorians. Greek worship, mixed with Assyrian, Phenician, and Phrygian gods, partly of Hellenic complexion, prevailed in all the islands of the Ægean and Ionian seas; on the coasts of Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Thrace; in Lower Italy and Sicily; in Crete, Cyprus, and Cyrene.

In the judgment of Herodotus it was Homer and Hesiod who settled their theogony for the Greeks, that is, in fact, composed the common Hellenic religion. Certain it is that these epic poets and their predecessors did extract a unity of the divine republic out of the various traditions of races and local superstitions. From the general diffusion of their works, particularly of the Homeric poems, which were publicly recited to assemblies of people by wandering minstrels in all parts of Greece, and from their thus fixing themselves in the memory and spirit of the people, it came to pass that these definite divinities, and the features of their existence, and their worship, as apprehended and worked out in poetry, filled and got possession of the religious conscience of the Hellenes, and formed the nucleus and substance of a common religion. There was an end now of the old formless gods of nature; and the gods of the Homeric imagination, in human shape and with human feelings, succeeded. These beings, conceived as idealised, unearthly, and immortal men, are, however, subject to nearly all the ordinary imperfections and passions of man, are bound by the law of space and the requirements of food and rest, and appear as hating and loving at will, often at variance with one another and kindling quarrels. They are divinities among whom the old physical ideas of

marriage and generation, strife and union, were invested with a motley garb of adventures and imaginary circumstances of human passion, and who in earlier times, with their sons, their relations, and favourites, were thrown into closest intercourse with men, engaged personally in their concerns, and followed, as it happened, the various impulses of love, or hatred, or contempt.

As, however, Herodotus points to Hesiod also, next to Homer, as joint founder with him of the Hellenic religious creed, and makes them both mythologues of the Greek gods, he also shows thereby the want of unity and harmony under which this condition of their system laboured, as being concocted out of multifarious elements, and as indebted to the worship in vogue amongst single races and colonies belonging to sundry nations. In comparing the system of Hesiod with the Homeric, we find a far larger enumeration in it of gods at variance, though genealogically related together; chiefly because these pedigrees, which before were fluctuating and variable, received from Hesiod an established dogmatic character, and hence his works have derived sufficient importance to admit of their being ranked next to Homer's as the sources and standard of the Hellenic religion. His cosmogony, running into theogony, is quite foreign to the direction and view taken in the Homeric poems. Hesiod informs us how out of chaos and the teeming earth the first severed energies of nature disengaged themselves, in a long succession of gigantic forms; how the earth-creating powers, the Titans, children of Gaia and Uranos, were at the same time originators of crime, hatred, and strife in the world; how, in fine, the new generation of gods gained the upper hand by overpowering the older one. Cronos mutilated Uranos, but was himself vanquished by his youngest son, Zeus, when the long struggle between the old and new gods commenced, and the Titans were thrust down into Tartarus along with Cronos. After Typhæus was also overcome, the six children of Cronos thenceforth reigned in quiet over the universe, apportioned amongst them; and the new gods, with whom Zeus as their progenitor had surrounded himself as safeguards of his power, completed the circle of Olympic divinities.

This Olympic confederacy consisted of a system of twelve gods, and being the only one in Greece to which the general title of Hellenic could apply, at least enjoyed a higher reputation than any other. According to the sagas, the worship of these twelve gods must have been established by Deucalion, or even by Hercules. In reality they were the divinities of various distinct races, who, from political considerations chiefly, were comprehended in an external unity through the number twelve; and being supported by the credit of the Amphictyons, bore the same names in Athens as in Rome—Zeus, Hera, Poseidon, Demeter, Apollo, Artemis, Hephæstos, Athene, Ares, Aphrodite, Hermes, and Hestia.

Only isolated traces of the older gods of the Hesiodic theogony were discoverable in the religious life of the Greeks. A cultus of Uranos does not seem to have existed at all. A rude stone image of Eros, however, was honoured in Hesiod's native place, and was held to be an old-world creator-god before the times of the Cronidæ. The Titans, the old powers of nature, who had their cultus supplanted by that of the Cronidæ, and were converted into potentates of the nether world, preserved their worship meanwhile in several instances. Thus in Titane, in the north of the Peloponnese, Titan and Helios were honoured; and Cronos, spite of his being compelled to lie in Tartarus under the guard of the Hecatoncheires, or hundred-handed giants, had a sanctuary in Athens, which he shared with Rhea. On the Cronian hill, near Olympia, sacrifice was offered to him; and he was also honoured at Creta and Lebadea.[1] Indeed, he appears already in Hesiod in the character of a ruler of the blest departed.

Thus then Zeus became and continued to be the supreme god, the strongest and mightiest; and the monotheistic character which mingles with his other lineaments, as he is sketched in the Homeric theology, came out stronger in the later poets, and with more consciousness in some respects—so much so, that at times he appears the only god really deserving the name. In the partition of the universe, the heaven, or ether, fell to his lot; and he remained always what the old Dodonean and Arcadian

[1] Pausan. i, 18. 7, vi. 20. 1; Dionys. Hal. i. 34.

Zeus was at first—ruler of the change of the atmosphere, the god of the lightning, thunder, and clouds, whose prerogative it was to refresh with rain, and grant the blessings of increase and abundant harvests. Besides, he was at the same time the personal centre of the world's course; on him all man's life and health depended, so far as his might was not limited by the decrees of destiny. And as he was the sovereign of the Olympic assemblage of gods, and the author of the present order of the world, his influence extended into the sphere of operations of other divinities, and functions were appropriated to him which appear to have been the exclusive right of others. As he was considered the physical progenitor of most of the kingly lines amongst the Greeks, it was fitting that kings, people, and cities should be under his guardianship. All human law was an emanation of Diké, Justice, enthroned at his side. He was the protector of the oath, avenger of perjury, and jealously guarded his own dignity. It was from him all that was good, as well as what was evil, flowed to man; it was his power that made itself felt in all the circumstances and conditions of human life. From him especially riches were looked for. Above all, he was distinguished as the benefactor of humanity, and the idea of a divine providence was pre-eminently attached to his name.[1] In feasts and solemn rites he was at one time the ruler of the human race, at another, the god of nature and the atmosphere, to whom the Hellenes did homage.

By the side of the elevated, and comparatively refined, poetical conception of the father of gods and men, the mythical representation now took its place in glaring contrast. According to this, the god, born in Crete, and saved by his mother from his child-devouring father, came into possession of the rulership of the world, not as an everlasting property, but had first to extort it by war and violence from a hostile dynasty. And then, after a voluntary renunciation of the fulness of power, by a division of it amongst his brethren, he is further obliged to subordinate his own will to the superior decrees of destiny, and, as he had begotten a succession of heroes in love

[1] *E.g.* Pindar, *Nem.* 1155.

intrigues with countless daughters of men, he appears withal as frequently tormented by the quarrelsome jealousy of his consort.

Hera, the old Pelasgian self-existent goddess of nature in the ante-mythical times, was coupled later on with Zeus, and, as his sister and consort, became the queen of the Olympic heaven. Her original, elemental character is discoverable also in the later conception and definition of her. For instance, people either imagined the province of her dominion to be the lower region of air, in contradistinction to the upper ether, the peculiar province of Zeus,—for, as is self-evident, Hephæstos, the god of the fire of earth, was her son, and Iris, the goddess of the rainbow, her attendant; or else she was interpreted to be a goddess of earth embraced by Zeus, under the notion of him as the vault of heaven, and it was her "holy espousals" with the vivifying, generating god of heaven that were yearly solemnised.[1] In her ethical aspect she was the protectress of women, and patroness of the marriage state. According to the expression of Aristophanes,[2] she kept the keys of marriage; and in Plato's Utopian republic it was to her the fine was paid by those who refused to marry.[3] In the case of Hera there is a clear indication of the influence which the superiority of particular tribes exercised upon the features of religion in the reciprocal intercourse of the Greek people. In divers places Zeus was united in marriage with this or that goddess; Dione, Leto, Eurynome, and Demeter were severally such consorts of the supreme god. All these, however, were sent to the rear in the fusion of the Greek tribes consequent on migratory expeditions, or their connection with Zeus was made a mere temporary one.

That Hera, then, the old Pelasgian goddess, kept her rank as the only and permanent consort of Zeus, is owing, we believe, to the influence of the Achæan race; for Homer styles the capitals of this race, Sparta, Argos, and Mycenæ, her favourite cities, *i.e.* the chief seats of her worship,[4]

[1] Plutarch, *Fragm.* p. 157; Aug. *Civ. Dei*, iv. 10.
[2] *Thesm.* 985 (976, Dindorf.).
[3] Plat. *Leg. Repub.* vi. p. 622 (ed. Bekker, vi. 17).
[4] Schömann, *das Ideal der Hera*, Greifsw. 1847, p. 21.

and it was the Achæan people who honoured Zeus more than all the other Greek races.

Water and sea deities were early worshipped, in vast numbers, by the inhabitants of a country such as Greece, consisting in great measure of islands and peninsulas, everywhere in contact with the sea, and cut up into thousands of its creeks and bays and arms. A cultus, however, existed nowhere of the father of all streams and springs, the Titanid Oceanos. Thetis, the sea-goddess, was only worshipped in three places, in Pharsalus, Sparta, and Messenia; with the exception of that in Ægæ, no worship of Triton occurs. Nereus, the ruler of the deep sea waters, was only invoked at Ægæ, and Gythium in the Peloponnese. The generality of Greeks knew but little of the Bœotian sea-god Glaucus, and the chameleon Proteus. The Nereids, however, the daughters of Nereus, as being the divine inhabitants of the deep, had altars and sanctuaries in sundry places. Leucothea, the sea-goddess of the Minyans, had divine homage paid to her at Corinth as mother of the sea-god Palæmon. Yet all these several worships and names were but fragments and remains of an older water-cultus, that had early fallen into neglect and been suppressed.

On the other hand, the old worship of Poseidon kept its ground and spread. This god, of foreign and Asiatic original, appears to have owed his first introduction to Carian and Phenician visitors of the coasts of Hellas. His worship in early times too, solemnised with a sacrifice of maidens, became odious in many places in Greece; in other places the attempt to naturalise him was a failure, and in many instances he was obliged to yield precedence to the other Hellenic divinities, his disgrace, no doubt, arising from his barbarian origin.[1] He was the god of all waters, sweet as well as salt; but he was lord of the sea *par excellence*; his throne was in the deep, and at the same time he was the earth-quaker, or earth-securer. For as man conceived the earth to be born of the sea, all agitations of nature were considered to be dependent on the sea or connected with it, and so were referred to him. His worship

[1] Gerhard, "Über Ursprung, Wesen und Geltung des Poseidon," *Berl. Akad. Abhandlg.* 1851, pp. 172 sqq.

was most frequently met with in the islands, on the coast, and in harbour cities, and more extensively amongst the Æolians and Ionians than Dorians and Achæans, though, according to the showing of Diodorus,[1] he was honoured above all the gods in most of the cities of Peloponnesus, and many races too in Bœotia, and the Peloponnese also ascribed their origin to sons of Poseidon. The Nereid Amphitrite became the consort of Poseidon only after Homer's time.

In nearest relation to Zeus, the heaven-god, was Pallas Athene, one of the oldest and most national of the Hellenic divinities. As a Pelasgian goddess of nature and the elements, with festal solemnities and local myths of physical signification, features and spheres of action were assigned to her hardly admitting of being reduced to any harmonious combination, and she united in herself all the attributes of a supreme female divinity. Still, the prominent idea in her was, that, as child and image of Zeus, the daughter of the god of the ether, born without mother in the empyrean, she was the goddess of the heavenly or ethereal fire and its brightness. Yet she was also conceived to be, and honoured as, the mistress of the clouds and the winds. When the Ionians appropriated her worship, she first became the stern virgin and warrior-goddess. In the myth of the Hesiodic theogony, where Zeus, having devoured his wife Metis (wisdom), who already bore Athene under her heart, then gave birth to the daughter from his head, we are presented for the first time with the intellectual and moral aspect of the goddess, as standing in the most intimate relation to her father. She was the being most richly endowed with wisdom by Zeus, and the conviction that this was her most striking characteristic impressed itself more and more on men's minds. Whatever in human life was dependent on understanding and judgment was now ascribed to her. As the much-honoured Athene Ergane, she was the patroness of works of hand and of the arts. Many cities were under her protection, as specially dedicated to her. Eloquence, also prudent counsel and good laws were attributed to her. Whatever blessings people asked

[1] Diodor. xv. 14.

for from her father, they also expected in general at her hands—victory in war, as well as all the blessings of peace. The idea of the goddess necessarily followed, and accommodated itself to every historical development through which Athens (the most famous and influential of the cities dedicated to her) passed. In the heyday of the Greek republics she was, of course, the goddess of freedom, and hated tyrants.[1] As she grew more and more of an idealisation and abstraction, she was blended with Metis, and became man's thought, wisdom, and knowledge, hypostatised, and hence was called the Highest, sitting, according to Pindar,[2] on the father's right hand, to deliver his judgments to the other gods.

The worship of Apollo spread far over each branch of the Greek family of races. He has so many features in common with Athene, that in many respects one might call him an Athene of the male species. As she is in the closest union with her father's essence, and his best-beloved daughter, so is Apollo, in Homer, the favourite son of Zeus, who, ever obedient to the father, announces his decrees to men. Already in the pre-Hellenic times his worship was much in fashion. At Ambracia, and in other cities of the Pelasgian period, he was represented in a conical form, in the shape of a pillar, and generally in the most varied guise; and his cultus was of the same kind. The principal localities for his worship were, Lycia, where he was the national god; Crete, from the northern coasts of which it was conveyed to the Greek and Asiatic coasts and islands, with its expiatory rites and its oracles; next, the island of Delos, peopled from Crete, as a centre of the Ionico-Attic worship of Apollo; and lastly, Delphi, for the northern parts of Greece and the Dorians, who, even after their conquest of the Peloponnese, remained in the closest relations with the Delphico-Pythian Apollo and his oracle, by continually consulting it.

Neither local traditions nor the forms of worship admitted of the personality of the god being regarded as the offspring of a single idea. Ingredients of an old worship of nature ran, in his case, into notions which

[1] Aristoph. *Thesm.* 1154 (1144, ed. Dindorf.).
[2] *Fragm.* vol. iii. p. 119.

savour of a later development of Hellenic life. In old traditions he appears as the god of death, who sends plague and destruction; and he is therefore armed with bow and quiver. In the Ionico-Asiatic cultus, he is god of the fruits of the field and their increase, as owing to the changes of the seasons. As Apollo Carneius in the Peloponnese, he was god of war and of shepherds at the same time; and in the Carneia, the festival of the Dorian race, the memorial of the wandering life of the early Dorians in camp and tent, was celebrated with warlike rites and symbols; while in the Hyacinthia, first sorrow for the decay of nature, caused by the heat of the sun, and then joy, in the hope of her reanimation, were expressed. As Zeus was honoured as Apomuios, or the averter of flies, so Apollo too had his worship as Smintheus, or exterminator of field-mice, and again as Parnopius, or averter of locusts. As Thargelios, he was a maturer of field produce; as Delphinius, he ruled over the sea and the storm; as Erythibius, he kept watch against the destruction of corn by fire. As is ordinary with the oldest divinities, his activity and might were displayed throughout the kingdom of nature. In many places he was invoked as Acesius, or preserver from sickness; and his aid was invoked particularly against epidemic pestilences, which he sent abroad by his arrows. Ever exulting himself in eternal youthfulness, he was also the protector and guardian of manly youth, and warlike courage was his gift. Plato has made a fourfold division of his ethical signification and action into music, prophecy, the healing art, and skill in archery.[1] God of prophetic, as of poetic, inspiration, he led the song and the dance. From him, the bright, shining, pure god, all that is morally impure and defiled must keep aloof. In lieu of the old vengeance of blood he introduced the expiation for murder. War conducted in an unrighteous and inhuman manner was an offence to him. He was generally the representative and expositor of the ideas of moral law to the Hellenes. All the distinctions they claimed to themselves, as well as whatever separated the Greek from the barbarian, was regarded as emanating from his essence and influence.

[1] *Cratyl.* 405 A.

But it was by his oracle at Delphi, of which all the Greeks were proud, that Apollo exerted so mighty an influence on the whole of Hellas, co-operating in every important event and every considerable institution that could be brought in any way within the range of religion. He it was to whom Lycurgus was necessarily indebted for the inspiration of his Spartan code; all the ordinances pertaining to public worship must have been, as Plato says, derived from Delphic sources, and be treated as inspirations of Apollo.[1] And, in truth, all existing religious arrangements had received Apollo's sanction, according to the belief of the Greeks; he either ratified them through the Pythia, or confirmed them through the answer always given when the oracle was consulted, that it was the will of the gods they should be worshipped by each and every citizen according to the tradition and institution of his own city.[2] Even war and peace, the sending out of colonies, the political constitutions of single states,—everything was placed under the prophetic guidance of Apollo.

The question whether Apollo, the son of the god of heaven and of the night (Leto), was originally the god of light only, or at the same time the sun-god, is one of the most intricate in the department of Greek religious history; for in Homer, throughout, Helios is distinct from Apollo. Planet worship generally was not a predominant feature in the Greek religion. Sun, moon, and stars were not principal objects of their reverence; at least they had ceased to be so in Hellenic times. Of the stars, Sirius alone appears to have been worshipped. Aristæus had recommended the islanders of Ceos to adore this star, to avert a danger that was threatening them from it.[3] A cultus of the moon (Selene) is nowhere to be found in earlier times; Helios, however, had his paid him very early, though it was brought over from Asia to Greece. This worship existed everywhere by the side of Apollo's, and entirely distinct from his, as was most strikingly the case in Rhodes, where, as the whole island was consecrated to the sun, his worship especially flourished; whilst in many spots of the same island Apollo was also honoured

[1] *Legg.* vi. p. 759 c. [2] Xenoph. *Memor.* i. 3. 1, iv. 3. 16.
[3] Diodor. i. p. 324 (lib. iv. 281, ed. Wesselingii); Apoll. Rhod. ii. 523.

as averter of fire from the corn; at Camirus, as god of the flocks and herds; and as the dart-casting plague-god, at Lindus, and elsewhere. So, too, Phidias coupled Helios with Apollo on the pedestal of the Olympic Zeus. Plato assures us[1] the Greeks prayed daily to Helios, and not to Apollo. It was first through the interpretation of the physical philosophers that Apollo became the sun; and this gloss made its way and spread far and wide, particularly through their pupil Euripides. "Rightly he names thee, Apollo (Destroyer), who knows the secret names of the demons," Phaëthon's mother said to his father Helios, in the tragedy of Euripides. This, as has been justly observed,[2] is no allusion to the doctrine of the mysteries, but is borrowed from the theocrasy of philosophers. In Plutarch's time this identification of Helios with Apollo was so generally prevalent, that he could say that the sun had thrown Apollo (his character and meaning) into oblivion amongst all men; though, for his own part, he would acknowledge the distinction between the two only as that between soul and body united together.[3]

The union of the twin pair, Artemis and Apollo, harmonising in all relations as we find them in Homer and all the poets, was not originally admitted along with the first worship of the two divinities; for the older local Apollo rites made no mention of Artemis; and *vice versâ*, Artemis was honoured without Apollo in places where the worship preserved its antique character. The association of the two originated with Delos and Delphi. Artemis was an old Pelasgic goddess of nature, to whom nevertheless attributes and functions so very different were assigned in the several places where she was honoured, that the attempt to reduce these functions and spheres of operation into a consistent theory can only be effected by means of an arbitrary and artificial construction in her case as well as Apollo's. The rites of Artemis Tauropolos, Brauronia, and the like, came from Thrace, where she was the supreme divinity of the land, and were at first celebrated with human sacrifices; as also that of Artemis

[1] *Legg.* x. p. 665 (vol. viii. p. 469, ed. Bek.).
[2] Otfr. Müller's *Dorien.* i. 290.
[3] *De Ryth. Orac.* vii. 575; Reisk. *de Orac. def.* vii. 706.

Orthia at Sparta, where scourgings to blood were substituted for them.[1] The Artemis Eurynome, at Phigalia in Arcadia, represented as a fisherwoman, and shown only once a year, lying in golden chains, betrayed her Asiatic original. There, in Arcadia, the goddess possessed the largest number of sanctuaries; where, generally, the old Pelasgic traditions were maintained undisturbed. The whole country, which traced its ancestral inhabitants from her, was in a measure consecrated to her.

The great variety of surnames, taken from mountains and waters, by which Artemis was distinguished above all the other divinities, points to her as a power of nature. The mountain and the chase were her highest attributes. As Limnatis or Heleia, she was frequently connected with marshes; as Potamia and Alpheionia, with rivers also; and as Acria and Coryphæa, with the mountain peaks. In her dealings with mankind she appears habitually as awful and severe. There is no other divinity to whom so many acts of revenge and bloodthirstiness were ascribed. Hence the sanguinary character of her earlier rites. Even sacrifices of children, afterwards replaced by scourgings, were offered to her; while, in later times, a trait of cruelty unusual for Hellas was preserved in her worship at Patræ—a number of wild beasts, great and small, were thrown alive into blazing piles in a circle round her altar.[2] The mere sight of her image, as the Greeks asserted, would fill every one with terror, wither up the very trees in the neighbourhood, and destroy their fruits.[3] Pestilences were of her sending; the sudden death, particularly of women, was her work. Spite of her maiden nature, she was, on the contrary, esteemed the protectress of births, nurse of women in labour, and guardian goddess of children. Thus she might be panegyrised, under many different titles, as kindly intentioned and placable; and we find her here and there honoured as a succouring divinity in peace and war, and protectress of towns. She appeared first in Æschylus as goddess of the moon, probably through some Asiatic influence of a late date.

At Ephesus the Artemis was a kind of pantheistic deity, with more of an Asiatic than Hellenic character. The attributes of nearly all female divinities were centred

[1] Pausan. iii. 16. 7. [2] *Ibid.* vii. 18. 7. [3] Plutarch, *Orat.* xxxii.

in her there. She was most analogous to Cybele, as physical mother and parent of all. She was the great goddess of Ephesus, the Protothronia,[1] and her worship had a world-wide fame; so that up to the time of Pausanias, there was hardly a city in Greece the people of which had not done homage to her as a puissant divinity. She was often invoked on special occasions, and had her worship too in private dwellings; even the Persians spared her sanctuary in their great devastating wars of reprisal against the Ionic Greeks. Ionian states contributed in a body to the building of her temple, nay, rather the whole of Asia Anterior. Her image, shaped like a mummy, was of black wood; the upper part of the body was ornamented with the breasts of animals, the lower with figures of them.[2]

Hermes, the old family god of the Tyrrhenian Pelasgi, and son of Zeus and the Atlantid Maia, had so much in common with Apollo, that he often seems to be a "double" of him, or a personification of the same religious idea. In the first instance he was originally personified and adored as the generative and fructifying power of nature, and represented as a Herma, or pillar of stone, with a head superadded and a phallus; under which form the Athenians received him from the Pelasgi, and the other Greeks from the Athenians. In Cyllene he was even honoured only as a phallus.[3] The ordinary attributes of an old god of nature were actually assigned him: he was god of the heights; furthered the growth of the products of the earth; gave increase to flocks and herds, as Nomios or Epimelios; as Trophonios, he protected the fields, and even the springs were his gift. Then, as member of the Olympic court and anthropomorphic god, he represented practical activity and inventive dexterity in human affairs. He was the nuncio and agent of the other gods, the god of speech, commercial intercourse, and trade, patron of fraud and perjury, and professor of thievery. Autolycus in Homer, who increases his property by thieving and perjury, is considered a son and pupil of Hermes.[4] His worship was diligently observed as Hermes Dolios, the overreacher, in the vicinity of Pallene; he

[1] Pausan. x. 38.
[2] *Ibid.* x. 38. 3; Callimach. *Hymn. Dian.* 237–250; Strabo, xiv. 789.
[3] Pausan. vi. 26.
[4] *Odyss.* i. 395, etc.

had the reputation of being quick to hear the prayers addressed to him;[1] and the myths delight in descanting upon the adroit purloinings of the king of thieves.[2] With all this, there was not in his character a bad and revengeful side, as in the other divinities; no act of revenge is ever recorded of him. On the contrary, he was a benevolent deity, the friend of man, who, as Pompæus or Agetor, accompanied mortals on their journeys, and whose images were encountered almost everywhere at the doors of houses, at the entrances of gardens, and in the streets and squares. In general, he was a god of blessing, who paid a gracious attention to the wishes of mankind, whose souls, after death, he also conducted, as the kindly Hermes Psychopompos, down to the kingdom of Hades.

Hestia was frequently associated with Hermes. Though of Pelasgic origin, she is not mentioned in Homer and Hesiod as a goddess, but first appears as such in the Homeric hymns and the lyric poets. She is called the eldest, and at the same time the youngest, daughter of Cronos and Rhea, and with her the circle of the twelve superior deities is complete. The timid reverence with which the ancients contemplated the mysterious substance and being of fire, had given birth to several deities; so Hestia too, in the historical period, became a personification, not of that element in general, but only of the fire burning on altars and domestic hearths. Hence she was the natural guardian of the hearth; and as every hearth was also a domestic altar, the sacrifices or offerings were also placed under her care. All sacrificers invoked her first, and, according to the expression of the Homeric hymn, she was partaker in the honours paid at every shrine. In the Prytaneia of the cities, each of which had their sacred hearth in common there, on which a fire was kept perpetually burning, the goddess as Prytanitis had her special sanctuary. The only legend about her was the way she foiled Apollo and Poseidon, when paying their addresses to her, and of her having touched the head of Zeus, and vowed perpetual virginity. With but few exceptions, she had neither image nor festival; only at Naucratis in Egypt her birthday feast was celebrated.[3]

[1] Pausan. vii. 27. [2] Eurip. *Rhesus*, 217. [3] Athen. iv. 32.

Ares was the god of the Thracian race, which, having penetrated into Bœotia and the Peloponnese, took his worship along with them; thus Thebes became the capital of the cultus of Ares, and from thence it spread further, until it cast into the shade that of Apollo, in his character as peculiar war-god of the Hellenes. From these circumstances, he was not known or recognised at all in the Greek islands, and but little, and in a few places, in Asia Minor. Originally he was a god of nature, and the principal agent in its violent and detrimental operations, and also in storms and pestilential maladies. This, his earlier signification, was replaced by his later, derived from his physical character of angry storm-god, and so he became god of war, and the wild joy of battle and carnage kindled in the fray. Homicide and bloodshed seem to be generally the distinguishing acts of Ares, and thence the Areopagus at Athens (as being a tribunal judging of life and death) was consecrated to him. Though son of Zeus and Hera, he was the one of all the Olympic deities the most hated of his own father, according to the expression put into the mouth of the Homeric Zeus himself; so that, even by Sophocles, he is stigmatised as, "the dishonoured one amongst the gods;"[1] and the way in which the poets couple his name with dissension, murder, madness, and deathly sickness, shows that people were minded to consider him, at least in poetry, as the originator of all the evils with which mankind was visited.

A double cultus from very different sources met in Aphrodite; on one side, the worship of the Pelasgic goddess of nature, the bestower of life and growth, the daughter of Zeus and his Dodonæan consort Dione, but who soon appears in Homer transformed into the Cyprian goddess. It was she who, as Aphrodite Aineias, in Acarnania and Epirus, patronised the breeding of cattle, and on the coasts thereabout was honoured as the goddess of navigation. On the other side, there blended with this domestic deity one who had come out of Asia by Cyprus, whom Hesiod describes as born of the ocean foam, impregnated by Uranos. This Urania is the goddess of propagation and procreation, whose worship, under different denominations,

[1] *Œdip. Tyr.* 214.

was widely extended amongst the Syrian, Phenician, and Canaanitish people. Cyprus, whose population was partly derived from Phenicia, received the worship of this deity from Ascalon, the headquarters of the Astarte cultus. This island was her favourite domicile. Here she must have first manifested herself to man. In the temple at Paphos stood her idol, of conical shape: there, and still more at Amathus, she was adored with all the abandonment of Asiatic wantonness. This worship was introduced from thence into Cythera, a small island to the south of the Peloponnese, whence it was imparted to the towns of the Peloponnesian coast. Even at a late period, the old Pelasgic Aphrodite and the Syrian Astarte were to be found side by side on Greek soil; for instance, at Ægira in Achaia, where they were honoured with separate sanctuaries, and rites bearing no resemblance to each other.[1]

Thus it came to pass that Aphrodite in her ancient cultus was far from being restricted to the mere narrow signification which poetry and later society attributed to her, but appeared in the more extensive one of supreme mistress of all the three provinces of nature. Hence the forms of her worship exhibited such great variety and such striking contrasts. For instance, while in Sicyon she was arrayed in the attributes of mistress of the world, her ministering priestess was a virgin, and bound to continence; whilst in Corinth an emulation in lewdness and debauchery was regarded as the cultus most agreeable to her. Thus in Athens she was honoured as the oldest of the Moirai, and also as special arbitress of life and destiny, and accordingly her Herma-like square image stood in the gardens near; while in Cyprus maidens consecrated themselves to her by prostituting themselves for money, as the Babylonian women did to the honour of Mylitta, on the other hand, where she was armed and placed at the side of Ares, her sanctuary was not accessible to women, at least in some places. In Thebes, and at Megalopolis in Arcadia, she was revered in three ancient images of carved wood, as Urania, Pandemos, and Apostrophia (the averter): a goddess also of death and the grave, and an Aphrodite Melainis and Androphonos, was here and there invoked.

[1] Pausan. vii. 26. 3.

At a later period, and in the reflection of some thinking minds rather than in the public conscience, a contrast between Aphrodite Urania and Pandemos was accepted: the former, the heaven-goddess, who in Phidias' statue at Elis set her foot upon a turtle, as a symbol of the vault of heaven, must be the motherless daughter of Uranos, and the deity of a nobler spiritual love. The Pandemos, on the other hand, daughter of Zeus and Dione, would be the protectress and inspirer of the common carnal instincts of sexual intercourse unsanctified by marriage. This is Plato's distinction; and others follow him, taking as a confirmation of their view the he-goat, or ram, which is the attribute of Aphrodite Pandemos. Certainly, as Xenophon remarks,[1] the Urania and Pandemos were distinguished by separate temples, altars, and images, and those who offered sacrifice to the former were required to be more holy than those who did so to the latter; and here is applicable a sacred epigram of Theocritus, in which happiness is implored for a married couple expressly from the Urania,[2] and not from the Cypris Pandemos. Probably the same Pandemos had originally another meaning, namely, that of a communal deity, whose cultus was a religious and political bond of union between distinct states or populations. On the other hand, the Hetairai sacrificed to the Urania as well as the Pandemos, and, in fact, offered her gifts which were the fruit of their earnings.[3]

As an Olympic goddess, and in all the myths relating to her, Aphrodite was the goddess of physical love and beauty, and their allurements. To tie and to cherish the bond of sexual passion was her chief employment. It was she who bestowed on women all that could win and captivate the thoughts and desires of man. Every state of soul produced by this passion of love, every event connected with it, all good and evil fortune, were referred to her, and expressed in the titles men assigned to her. Her authority in this sphere was irresistible; and the myth reported many traits of overwhelming revenge taken by her for contempt of her power, not unfrequently by her kindling unnatural and incestuous passions. She was also the goddess of

[1] *Sympos.* viii. 9.
[2] *Epigr.* xiii.
[3] Lucian, *Dial. Mort.* vii.; Dioscor. *Epigr.* xii.; *Anthol.* i. 247.

harlots and Hetairai, as Hermes was the god of thieves; and places of impure resort were consecrated to her. The Hetairai in Corinth were regarded as her priestesses. According to Greek ideas, there must have been something divine, acceptable to, and prescribed by, the goddess even in grossest sensual excitement and beastly lust. Hence in many places were found sanctuaries and rites of an Aphrodite Hetaira and Porné, as at Abydos, Samos, and Ephesus; and even the temple Solon erected to her in Athens was built out of the earnings of prostitution.[1] Moreover, as the physical side of the marriage relation fell within her province, she was also invoked as the goddess of marriage, and besides as providing for birth and issue (Kolias).

Hephæstos, whose worship had been transmitted to the Greeks from the Thracian inhabitants of Lemnos, and was in high estimation, particularly in Athens, without, however, attaining to any greater extension, was distinguishable from that of the other Olympic divinities: whereas in the case of these latter, their originally physical and elementary character receded, and in great measure disappeared, from the conscience of the Greeks; he, on the contrary, was always contemplated in the closest connection with the element of fire, and the customs of speech even frequently substituted his name instead of the word "fire." He did not, however, reckon as the lord of ethereal primal fire of the universe, but the tame element that requires feeding—the gross, impure, and earthly fire was his domain. In burning volcanic mountains, the Mosychlos of Lemnos, and Ætna, he had his seat and his workshop, according to popular tradition. He was also a cunning smelter of metals, and a smith-god; and the Cyclops, in the later poetry, were his hardworking journeymen. In Athens his cultus was closely related with that of Athene, the goddess of the ethereal fire, and of the light without the blaze. Two festivals, the Chalceia and the Apaturia, were sacred in common to both deities; and Hephæstos besides was honoured as the god of the fire-hearth, as Hestia was.[2]

Demeter belonged to the old Pelasgic cultus, and was the goddess of corn and agriculture. It was she, they said,

[1] Athen. xiii. 15.

[2] Plut. *Legg.* xi. p. 920; Diodor. v. 74.

first made the Greeks acquainted with the growing of cereals, the operations of tillage, and the preparation of bread; and as the fostering of agriculture was considered the foundation and commencement of all social and political ordinances, and inseparably connected with the introduction of peaceful and orderly ways of life and the good conduct of the domestic state, Demeter, under her title of Thesmophoros, was the ennobler of mankind, the foundress of civilisation and lawgiving. Hence her various names are drawn from the sowing and earing and harvesting of corn, from the mill, and from bread; while she was also held to be the institutrix of the marriage-contract, and guardian of the children begotten in it, or *Curotrophos*. To this contributed the analogy man found between the ploughing up of the soil, accompanied by the sowing of the seed, with marital cohabitation. In the feasts and mysteries of the goddess, the contrast presented by mankind still in their rude state, and making shift without cereals, and their life when blessed with the possession of these products through the medium of agriculture, was depicted in a vivid manner. And as the same soil which fructifies the seed also receives the remains of the departed, so Demeter was in addition a deity of death, and thence called the black: the dead were sacred to her as Demetrians, so they were called in Athens, and twelve days after the death of a citizen a mortuary sacrifice was offered to her.

This double character, of a deity of life and death, is still more strongly marked in the daughter of Demeter, the Persephone Coré. She and her mother formed an inseparable pair, and the most closely united in point of cultus, so that the two were styled the twin deities merely, or "the revered"; or occasionally, too, "the great goddesses." In Homer she appears simply as the stern, dread goddess of death, mistress of the lower world of shadows: her ministers are the Erinyes, and her occupation is to put curses into execution, and to take vengeance for delinquencies. In the old Arcadian tradition she is entitled the queen, and was the daughter of Poseidon, who had violently ravished her from her mother, who was styled Demeter Erinys because of her rage on that account. Another and more extensively received legend makes her the Coré, or daughter,

of Zeus and Demeter, and is connected with the story of her rape by the death-god Hades, or Pluto; so that as Coré she is the goddess of the spring vegetation shooting up out of the earth; but as Persephone, the consort of Hades, the destroyer of all living, and the sovereign queen of the dead. The wanderings of Demeter in search of her daughter, her disconsolateness for her loss, the disappearance and return of the abducted one, the division of Coré between the upper and lower world established by Zeus, the alternations of joy and sorrow, when the seed is first committed to the earth to decay, and afterwards to spring up to a new life, or when Coré descends into Hades, to return, like the sprouting seed, to her mother,—all this formed rich materials for myths, festivals, and mysteries, when tricked out in all the treasures of Greek imagination.

Hades or Pluto, as the Zeus of the nether world, ruled by the side of Persephone the shades of the realm of death, the drear and dark region, hated of gods and men, the key of which he alone was in possession of. He was at the same time a god of earth and an agrarian power,—the reason why he is represented with a cornucopia, or bunch of ears of corn, in his hand; and Hesiod recommends[1] the farmer while ploughing to pray to him as well as Demeter. Yet it devolved rather upon the poets to delineate his features; the people did not trouble themselves much about him, and they saw no altars dedicated to him.[2] There was an image of him at Athens, but he had hardly anywhere a regular worship. It was only at Elis and Pylos he was honoured. His temple at Olympia was only opened once a year, and even then the priests never entered it.[3]

Dionysos was the youngest of the Grecian gods; and though his cultus was the last important offshoot of the Greek religion, that of no other god had so deep an influence on the civilisation, poetry, and art of the nation as this. The peculiar features of heathenism come out in such bold relief in no other instance,—such passionate sympathies with natural circumstances, such strong desire

[1] *Op. et Dies*, v 465.
[2] Eustath. *ad Iliad*, 744, 745.
[3] Pausan. vi. 25.

to experience them in self, to surrender self wholly to natural life in the wildest intoxications of sense, joined with the illusion that the powers at work in natural occurrences had a kind of divine property, and therefore that their operation in man shared also somewhat of the divine, and the well pleasing to the deity.

Was Dionysos originally a Thracian, and thus an indigenous Greek god of flocks and vineyards, whose characteristics were only changed later on by the Lydo-Phenician worship of Cybele and Sabazios? or was he a god originally foreign to the Greeks, who had come from the East, and was likely to have migrated into Greece from Asia in company with those who brought over and introduced the cultivation of the vine? There seem to be overpowering reasons for the admission of the latter hypothesis. Dionysos was manifestly a wandering and conquering god; his worship had performed pilgrimages all outside of Greece Proper and in Asia. Hence poets and mythic writers have located his mysteries in every country of the East. Old monuments represent him in Oriental garb and attitude; later he assumed a pure Hellenic character. The beasts sacred to him too, the panther and ass, indicate an Asiatic source. As the invention of wine came from Western Asia, the Thracian Nysa cannot certainly be considered the birthplace of the worship of Dionysos, but that Nysa which is situate between the Nile and Phenicia in Northern Arabia, or Cœlesyria. This the Greeks afterwards called Scythopolis, the Semites Bethsan; and the old notice of the physician Philonides, that Bacchus had brought the grape from the Red Sea to Greece,[1] serves to corroborate the view. And then the frequently occurring communications between the countries bordering on the Red Sea and India explain how, since the time of Alexander, the traditions of the god's expeditions must have reached India.

The rites also in the cultus of Dionysos, particularly in the Trieteric festivals, discover striking traces of Oriental religious ways. His surname of Omestes is a reminder of the feast of the Omophagia, the revolting ceremonies of which savour of a Phrygian rite. The devouring of raw

[1] Athen. xv. 5.

flesh seems to have been a remnant of the old human sacrifice; and the more so, because even Themistocles sacrificed three Persian prisoners to Bacchus Omestes;[1] and because, at Potnia in Bœotia earlier, and later at Lesbos and Tenedos, the rites of Dionysos were in like manner accompanied with human sacrifices. Surely an offering of human life and blood would not have been made in the oldest times to a purely Greek divinity of wine and vine-dressers.

The Hellenes received the god and his worship first from the southern Thracians living between Parnassus and Helicon. From thence it advanced into Bœotia, which now became the headquarters, so that Thebes claimed to be the birthplace of the deity. Extending into Attica, it was there complicated with the service of Demeter, and at the same time made its way into the Peloponnese, while combining with the worship of Apollo at Delphi. The record of the energetic resistance made at first to the introduction of this cultus was preserved in the mythical traditions of Thebes, Orchomenos, and Argos. The Greeks nationalised the god amongst them, whilst they provided him a myth and a genealogy corresponding to their genius, in which, notwithstanding, the occurrence of the names of Cadmus and Phœnix are suggestive of an Asiatic origin. Homer, who takes but little notice of him, and does not admit him into the society of the denizens of Olympus, still gives a hint of the nature of his worship at the time, inasmuch as he denominates him the raving god.

Shepherd life and the cultivation of the grape, the growth of the vegetable kingdom, and general productiveness, were in Greece the primary vocation and sphere of the god. He bade not only the grape but the trees and plants ripen. In Sparta he was Sukites, the fig-god. The increase of the flocks and herds was asked of him, as were the blessings of marriage by wives; and hence at his feasts never failed to be found the phallus, the symbol of generative power, carried about in processions. As dispenser of wine, too, he was equally held to be the convivial inspirer of riotous merriment in music, the dance, and the banquet.

[1] Plutarch, *Themist.* xiii.; Pelop. xxi.

Dionysos also maintained his Asiatic character as god of the creative and fostering principle of nature, which forced forward fructification; and thus, in heathen fashion, the alternations in nature, the death of her life in winter, and her revivification in spring, were further committed to him. The Dionysic festivals accompanied the god and his gift, the grape, in a yearly cycle, through all the steps of growth to its maturity in the vintage. The rites set forth symbolically the nature of the god, and joy and sorrow both derived from them an orgiastic character, as we may say; amid the din of Phrygian flute and tinkling cymbal, people were thrown into a state of enthusiasm, an excitement bordering on frenzy and unrestrained savageness, which seized contagiously the spectator alike and the participator in the revels, and was held to be the immediate operation of the divinity. Thus, in particular, the Mænad festival of the Trieteria was celebrated every night on the mountains during the winter solstice.

As a god of the lower world, Dionysos was styled Zagreus, especially in the mysteries; he was not, however, considered the son of Semele, but begotten by Zeus in the form of a serpent in intercourse with Persephone; he was even converted into a son of Demeter; and, as she received her ravished daughter back in the spring from the lower world, so Zagreus too was resuscitated in his bloom, who had been torn in pieces by the earth-born Titans. The commemoration of his sanguinary laceration and new birth was made in a gloomy rite of blood—at first by human sacrifice, which was mitigated to the simple scourging of women at the altar in Arcadia; whilst at Orchomenos, at the Agrionian feast, the virgins selected for sacrifice could usually escape by flight. Still, in Plutarch's time, one of them was caught by the pursuing priest and really sacrificed. The laceration of beasts, as typifying his own, and the devouring of raw flesh, was part of the service of the god. He was also regarded and invoked as a bull; "honoured bull," he was addressed in the hymn with which the women of Elis greeted him, and begged him, the "ox-footed," to come and visit his temple.[1] Hence, too, he was represented in the form of a bull, for instance at

[1] Plutarch, *Quæst. Gr.* 37, vol. vii. p. 155, ed. Wyttenb.

Cyzicus; or the beast, which stood in his stead, was lacerated, and the god was then sought for by the Mænads, and invoked with loud outcries.

Confined within a far narrower circle, and having much less bearing generally upon the modes of Greek religious thought, was the worship of such divinities as Eros, Pan, Priapus, and Asclepios. Eros, not mentioned by Homer, is represented in the theogony of Hesiod as a primal creator-god, who, without father or mother, is the most beautiful and irresistible of all deities, by whom the universe of things was first reduced into harmonious order. After being first honoured at Thespiæ in Bœotia in the old Pelasgic form of a stone, he acquired a cultus at Athens, in the Peloponnese, and the islands also. The Spartans and Cretans sacrificed to him before battle, probably because they had trust in him, as being the god of the mightiest combinative impulse, that he would inspire chivalrous daring and orderly discipline in the fight. It was only later he passed for a son of Aphrodite, whom she had borne to Zeus, Ares, or Hermes. Phidias nevertheless represented him as an independent deity, who received Aphrodite on her birth.[1] According to the account of Pausanias, however, the greater proportion of people held him to be the youngest of all the gods. He was always represented as a lovely youth, with quiver, arrows, and torches, as the god of impassioned human love, with all the surnames attaching to that passion in its various affections and operations, whence too he is described as exercising a tyrannical jurisdiction over both gods and men.

Pan was an Arcadian pasture and herd god, half he-goat, half man, housing in dale and cave. He is not mentioned by either Homer or Hesiod. His worship was first introduced into Athens at the time of the Persian war on a special occasion, but was also practised in Thessaly, Thebes, and Delphi. How this jovial, goat-footed deity, delighting in music and dance, came also to be worshipped as god of light, or fire, with torch-race and a fire kept burning perpetually on his altar, is highly perplexing. The ithyphallic Priapus was also a god, who bestowed productiveness on flock, field, and garden. He was son of Dionysos

[1] Pausan. v. 11. 3.

and Aphrodite, and was honoured on the Hellespont at Lampsacus, Parium, Cyzicus, and elsewhere.

Asclepios, god of the healing art and of health, was a son of Apollo, extracted by his father from the dead body of his mother, whom he had put to death from motives of jealousy. Though worshipped before in isolated places in Thessaly, he became an Hellenic god first in Homer's time, and by degrees his temples spread over the whole of Greece. The headquarters of his cultus were Tricca in Thessaly, Epidauros, the most frequented of all the Grecian holy places, Cos, and Pergamus. His sanctuaries were frequently erected close by warm springs, that were sacred, and served by priests who had an hereditary acquaintance with the science of medicine. The oracles attached to the temples of the god were consulted through the medium of incubation. It was believed the god showed the sleeper on the spot the requisite means for cure in dreams. Nevertheless, the interpretation of the priest seems in most cases to have come between the dream and the mode of treatment for the cure.

Hebe, or Dia, and Ganymede, the personification of youth in its bloom, were worshipped at Phlius, Sicyon, and Athens. But Eos, the goddess of the rosy morn, on whom so many legends of love and love adventure were fastened, appears not to have had a worship anywhere. The planet worship of the East was also entirely strange to the Greek. Orion, Sirius, and the Pleiades and Hyades, were, indeed, established heavenly beings, mythically and poetically speaking, but they too had no cultus. Amongst the deities of the winds, Æolus, the king of them, appears only to have been a creation of the later poets, and was, in fact, nowhere honoured. On the other hand, Boreas had a holy place consecrated to him at Megalopolis, and the inhabitants of the town offered an annual sacrifice to him as their protector against the Spartans.[1] Zephyros, too, had an altar at Athens. At an altar between Sicyon and Titane a priest offered a nocturnal sacrifice to the winds in general every year. Iris, the goddess of the rainbow, and divine messenger, was only honoured by the Delians of the island of Hecate with offerings of cakes and fruits.

[1] Pausan. viii. 36. 4.

The Hours, goddesses of the seasons and fosterers of agriculture, and therefore ministers of the Olympic deities, were worshipped in Attica, Argolis, and Elis. Athens was only acquainted with two, Thallo and Carpo, spring and autumn Hours. In Hesiod they are daughters of Zeus and Themis, three in number—Eunomia, Diké, and Irene, names which attribute legislative ordinances in human life to their charge. With a strong affinity of signification to that of the Hours, follow the Charites, or Graces, whose widely spread worship, celebrated even in Arcadia, mounted up to the Pelasgic period: honoured in Orchomenos as goddesses of the first rank, they had, as is evident from the names assigned them at Athens, a physical meaning at first, relative to the course of the year and to growth; but under the hand of the poets they were converted into goddesses of sweetness and womanly grace.

Personifications of abstract ideas were formed into deities by the Greeks, and a cultus was then assigned them in order to acquire their favour, to merit their gifts, and to appease their enmity or ill-temper. Thus Tyché, the goddess of lucky accident, or good fortune, had temples and images in many of the Greek cities. Pindar was the first of the poets to address her as a goddess, and he lauds her as the mightiest of the Moirai.[1] Up to the latest times she was revered as the disposer of the affairs of cities and people. The division of one goddess into a number of little Tychai was pressed so far, that by degrees a Tyché of their own was attached to each family, and to each individual member of a family. As giving good counsel, and supporting legal order, and as assessor of Zeus, Themis, the mother of the Hours, was worshipped at Thebes, Athens, Olympia, Trœzen, and Tanagra.

Nemesis was originally, as it appears, a goddess of nature, only known in particular localities, and honoured at Smyrna and Cyzicus, at Patræ, and in Asia Minor, but especially at Rhamnus in Attica; and in that character she was mother of Helena by Zeus. From the time of the Persian wars she acquired an ethical signification, and became the goddess of justice, assigning to each his measure, and giving every one his due,—the personification

[1] *Olymp.* xii. 1; Pausan. iv. 30, vii. 26.

of the jealousy ascribed to the god by the ancients; and hence she was contemplated often as an inimical power, morose and threatening towards the prosperous, but ever the avenger of all insolence.

The three goddesses of destiny, or Moirai, under the titles of Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos, represent the spinning of the threads of life, the lot assigned to man and its inevitability; and were considered to have a special influence on the birth, marriage, and death of men, besides being held to be the preservers of natural and moral order. Zeus Moiragetes was reverenced as their protector at Olympia and Delphi, and, according to Pausanias,[1] was so termed because he knew what the Moirai had in reserve for men, and what destiny refused them. As for the Moirai themselves, they were more prominent in poetry than in the life and religion of the Greeks. It was only in Olympia, Sicyon, Thebes, Corinth, and Sparta that they had altars and sanctuaries. The case was the same with their sisters, the Erinyes. The two rites were combined, as in Sicyon, where the altar of the Moirai stood in the grove of the Furies, and the same sacrifice of a sheep was offered there to both. The Erinyes were infernal spirits of punishment and retribution, who, according to Hesiod, were born of Gé, from the drops of blood which fell upon her from Uranos at the time of his emasculation. Ministers of Hades and Persephone, they avenged originally every infraction of the order of nature. Hence the saying of Heraclitus, that in case the sun should swerve from his course, he would be sure to be reined in by the Erinyes;[2] and also the custom for those who awoke from a deathlike swoon not to approach their sanctuary.[3] The poets, in great measure, and still more the extraordinary influence which the Orestean myth exercised over the Greek imagination, contributed largely to their becoming personifications of the terrors and torments of conscience under the sense of a heavy crime; and they were reckoned the implacable avengers of the transgressions which the Greeks hated most —the breaking of oaths, the violation of the laws of hospitality, homicide, parricide especially, and the murder of

[1] Pausan. v. 15. 4. [2] Plutarch, *de Exit.* xi.
[3] Hesych. *Lex. v.* δευτερόποτμοι.

relations. And yet they could be appeased and softened. In such case, as Eumenides, kindly disposed and revered goddesses, they had a cultus at Sicyon, Thebes, and Athens. In the last-named city they were worshipped as earthly goddesses of blessing, who were, notwithstanding, terrible and severe to grievous criminals. Their other sanctuaries also, that in Arcadia, not far from Megalopolis, and their temple at Ceryneia in Achaia, were connected with the Orestean myth.

The Muses were primarily nymphs of the springs, of which they were divine tenants; and to which, on account of their mineral properties, or because they were impregnated with earthy vapours, an inspiriting effect was attributed. The great discrepancy in their names and number, and in the account of their origin, arose from every Hellenic land having Muses of its own, who had almost always been honoured as springs. Even in Lydia, the nymphs of the Gygæan lake, who were esteemed the inventors of flute-playing, were called Muses. Wherever their worship was in special repute, in Bœotia on Helicon, and at Delphi on Parnassus, they were worshipped as the goddesses of poetical inspiration, song, and music, with sometimes Apollo, and sometimes Dionysos, at their head as Musagetes. On the whole, however, this cultus made no profound impression on popular life, though indeed they had temples, altars, or consecrated springs, in Sicyon, Megalopolis, Thespiæ, Corinth, Ambracia, and near Athens: in Sparta they even sacrificed to them before battle.

Hecate, or the "far-working," belongs to the most enigmatical of the apparitions of Greek theogony. Not alluded to by Homer, in Hesiod's theogony she is described as daughter of the wisest of the Titans, to whom Zeus conceded all the honours and powers she had been already in possession of during the period of the Titanic dynasty; so that she exerted a sovereign rule of threefold operation in the three empires of the universe, heaven, earth, and sea. Being thus a mighty mediatrix between gods and men, and the bestower of all gifts necessary or to be desired in all the manifold conditions of human life, and invoked by and present to all sacrificers, she bore prayers

on high to the gods. This representation is so different from the estimation of her in the practical life and religion of the Greeks, that, in fact, the Hesiodic Hecate only makes us acquainted with an outline of the idea of a far-reaching energy, latent in the name of the goddess; a personification of divine omniscience and omnipotence, in so far as such was ideally admissible in the anthropomorphic gods of the Greeks.

Hecate was a foreign goddess of the moon, who made an early migration into Greece. At Ægina she was worshipped as a goddess of the first rank, and she had an important place in the Cabiric mysteries of Samothrace. She was called Daughter of the Night, and the torches she bore were significant of the moon; those that were elevated, of the waxing moon—the depressed, of the waning. She was represented with three bodies, or with three heads, as the goddess of the star of night, energising in three spheres of action—in heaven, and earth, and sea, and at the same time in allusion to the three phases of the moon. Called Euodia and Trioditis, as conductress of wanderers at night, she was a goddess of paths and roads, the paths of the sea inclusive, whence she is styled a sea-goddess by Melanthius;[1] therefore her image was very frequently set up on roads, particularly at diverging and cross ones, as also in the streets of cities before houses; and at every new moon, or the thirtieth evening of each month, people used to set before her sacred viands, which were frequently consumed afterwards by the famished poor. As a necessary consequence, the goddess of the pale moonshine was also queen of the spirits and ghosts of the night. Accompanied by the souls of the dead, she hovered about their graves. In grisly guise, with torch and sword in hand, serpent-feet and serpent-hair, and followed by big black dogs, she struck terror into the traveller.[2] To her, in general, all the phantoms and visions of the night, all effects of sudden panic befalling mankind, were ascribed.[3] As a magic power and influence that excited frenzy were supposed to proceed from the moon, Hecate was also invoked at the

[1] *Ap. Athen.* vii. p. 325 C.
[2] Lucian, *Philopseud.* 22, 23; Schol. Apollon. iii. 862.
[3] Hippocr. *de Morbo sacro*, p. 16, ed. Diez.

preparation of magical charms, to impart strength and effect to them; and she was much in demand as the ordinary patron goddess of witchcraft. The opinion, that Hecate became an actual goddess out of one of the titles of Artemis, has no foundation in fact. It is true the tragic poets interchange the one with the other, but that is only because Artemis also was sometimes regarded as goddess of the moon. As goddess of the moon, and consequently of the night, Hecate also belonged to the lower world, was reckoned one of the nether deities, and converted into a daughter of Demeter. Hence she is identified with Proserpine, or attached to her either as sister, or servant and companion, and in that character was introduced into the circle of the Eleusinian mystery worship.

The wild, riotous, orgiastic worship of the Asiatic mother of the gods, Cybele, who was held to be identical with the Cretan Rhea, spread early over Greece. A metroön of her own had been erected to her at Athens probably long before the time of Pericles, which did duty also as a public record-office. In Thebes, Pindar built her a sanctuary before the doors of his house; and she had also an established cultus amongst the people of Anagyrus in Attica, at Acriæ in Laconia, and Dyme in Achaia, as also in Sparta and Olympia. Besides, her worship had been long ago domesticated among the Greeks of Asia Minor. She was the goddess of highest repute in Smyrna and Magnesia, on the Hellespont and Propontis. With her cultus that of the Phrygian mountain-god Sabazius was connected. This god, a symbol of the generative power of nature, her decay, and her revivification, and originally one with the Phrygian Attis, was, through the Orphic school, blended in Greece with Dionysos: and his worship too was celebrated with ceremonies of noisy, boisterous debauchery and low comedy. In fact, he always remained a foreign and despised god in the eyes of the Greeks.

In the Greek religion, the next post to the real deities was occupied by the demons, being of no small significance in point of cultus, and still more in religious teaching. Homer, indeed, acknowledges no intermediate being of this name; with him the term 'demon' is, for the most part, convertible with 'god.' But Hesiod taught the existence

of a whole race of immortal demons. According to him, no less than three myriads of such aerial spirits are interposed as mediators between gods and men. Residing in the regions of the air, they are associated together as protectors and guardian spirits of men, charged with imparting divine gifts to them.[1] In a wider sense, the Greeks included their heroes also among the demons, and so the cultus of both had a certain resemblance. Still, there was in substance a marked distinction between a hero who had once been a pilgrim of earth in a mortal frame, and a demon spiritual and shadowy, yet conceived to be of divine origin, and always superhuman. Indeed, the demons in later times appear to have been put on an equal footing with the deities; and, on the other hand, several of the gods—Eros, Pan, and the nymphs, for example—to have been accounted only demons.[2]

There was another class of demons, composed of beings who were attributed to the higher deities, as their subordinates and ministering spirits, and were their followers, as Plato says.[3] These god-demons were sometimes sacrificed to before the sacrifice appointed for the higher gods; and it was a regulation of the people of Opus, that there should be one set of priests for gods, and another for demons.[4] The belief in demons of the person, or guardian spirits of individuals, was of an early date. Phocylides in his time (*Olymp.* 58) speaks of demons allotted to man; Pindar and Menander both bear testimony to the same belief, the former making Zeus rule the demons friendly to men, the latter putting a demon at every man's side, as the "beneficent mystagogue of his life."[5] This idea must, in reality, have received its principal impulse from the schools of philosophy; and yet it made but a slight impression on the life and moral sense of the people, not so much as the dread of evil demons. According to the received opinion, Empedocles had been the first to introduce a dualism of good and evil beings of this sort amongst the Greeks.[6]

[1] *Op. et Dies*, 109–150, 250 sqq.
[2] Plutarch, *Def. Orac.* xvii. and xviii.; Hesiod, *ap. Plutarch, l.c.* 415.
[3] *Legg.* viii. pp. 828, 834, 848. [4] Plutarch, *Quæst. Gr.* vi.
[5] Pind. *Pyth.* v. 114, Dissen; Menand. *ap. Clem. Al. Strom.* v. 260.
[6] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 726 (259?).

Hippocrates, however, mentions that superstitious men fancied themselves surrounded, day and night, by evil-intentioned demons. In authors up to Plutarch's time, there is hardly notice of any but good demons; a fact explained by the way people avoided all mention of the bad, from a kind of dread of making any evil prognostication.[1] The Agathodemon, a god of festivity, and particularly favourable to the wine-crop, whom it was the custom to return thanks to at meal-times, belongs to the order of demons, but, like other gods, only in the wider signification.

The worship of heroes was far more general, and made a much deeper impression on the whole mind of the Greeks. Their number was incalculable and always increasing; for almost every name in the former world of fable had its grave, somewhere or other, in Greece, and to this was annexed the cultus that was consecrated to the bearer of it. The ancestors of the most distinguished races, the founders of states, and of social life and orders, the brave defenders of hostile attacks,—these all enjoyed hero honours. Most of the champions and women spoken of by Homer were honoured as heroes somewhere or other. Even Agamemnon's herald, Talthybius, was exalted to this dignity;[2] and, in many instances, the accident of Homer having mentioned their names merely was a sufficient reason. The larger number became heroes either in consequence of their divine descent or extraordinary exploits; but every little corporation of citizens, or of a trade, would have its founder canonised as hero; and, according to the Greek canon, mere beauty of person, or any unusual display of strength, soon formed a sufficient ground for inserting a dead man into this order, and for warranting his invocation as a superior being.

Thus it came to pass, that not only Lycurgus and Aristogeiton, but those also who fell in the battles of Marathon and Platæa, were entitled to this cultus.[3] Diognetus, the Cretan athlete, owed his elevation to it simply on account of his strength and dexterity. A wild brigand chief, Drimacos of Chios, who had himself killed by

[1] Petersen, *Hausgottesdienst der alten Griechen*, p. 55.
[2] Herodot. vii. 134.
[3] Pausan. i. 32. 4; Plutarch, *Arist.* xxi.

the hand of his minion, was made a hero of. An oracle, issued about 490 B.C., on the sudden disappearance of Cleomedes of Astypalæa, pronounced him to be the last of the heroes,[1] in spite of his evil deeds. This declaration, however, did not prevent the perpetual addition of new heroes to the old stock. Otus and Ephialtes were honoured in Naxos and Anthedon, though the myth represented them as arrogant blasphemers of the gods.[2] In Locris, Euthymus, an athlete, while still alive, received the homage of his countrymen as hero, at the bidding of the Delphic oracle.[3] So far did this go, that not only corporate bodies, but even the villages, would have their own heroes, of whom in many instances no one had anything to specify. Often, too, those who were gods at an earlier period sank down to mere heroes. This was the case where the deity belonged to a people subsequently subjugated, or emigrants. The event of his worshippers being driven into obscurity, or their dislodgment, would in a measure react on himself; as also where the cultus of a deity, identical, or connected in meaning, with the old one, received such an impulse from favourable external circumstances as to oblige the older deity to leave to his more fortunate rival his former post and dignity. Sometimes, too, difference of race caused the actual identity of the old and new deity to be overlooked, and then the former was degraded to a hero; or mere surnames of deities were personified as individual heroes. Hence we find Dionysos in many places ranking only as a hero; and Trophonios, who was worshipped at Lebadeia as Zeus Trophonios, was elsewhere esteemed a hero only.

Heroes, in fact, had, for the most part, a very narrow circle of operation, and were confined to the radius of their own race, their own city, or their own family; whilst the gods took part in the general government of the world. So the notion was, that Achilles only ruled the waters in the neighbourhood of his own island; but that the gods controlled the whole surface of the ocean.[4] Hence the heroes were also designated as demi-gods; and being placed, after Hesiod's time, next in grade to demons, were somewhat confused with them. As guardian and protecting

[1] Pausan. vi. 9. 3. [2] Diodor. v. 50, 51. [3] Plin. *H. N.* vii. 48.
[4] Arrian, *Peripl. Pont. Eux.* p. 23, ed. Hudson.

spirits, and as ministering powers, they were invoked on occasions of difficulty, and particularly in war, and were conciliated and appeased with sacrifices. For example, the Locrians always left a vacant space in their line of battle for Ajax, the invisible hero who fought along with them.[1] Sometimes it happened that a country's heroes were forwarded, as powerful auxiliaries in battle, to its distant allies, on their asking for aid. Thus the Spartans promised the Locrians to send the Dioscuri to their aid; and the Æginetans assured the Thebans, when they implored succour from them, that they would expedite the Æacidæ for the purpose.[2] Still, on the whole, heroes were almost more dreaded as mischievous and harmful beings;[3] and Herodotus ascribes an irresistible power to their anger. Hence there were many dead people who were only honoured as heroes because others desired thereby to atone for an act of injustice perpetrated on them—for instance, their murder. Even human sacrifices were offered to particular heroes, as to Peleus and Chiron at Pella.[4] The distinction between good and bad heroes was, as may be supposed, first invented by the philosophers.

The greater number of the old heroes who enjoyed a cultus passed as sons of deities, or were brought into relationship with a god somehow or other. In their case, not unfrequently by a kind of apotheosis, or Olympic transfiguration, a formal remove into the definite state took place, and then they became entitled to the worship only due of right to deities. On the other hand, the demon heroes, whose bodies people imagined they were in possession of, or which they had brought into the country in consequence of the advice of some oracle, dwelt in their tombs or the vicinity of them, and thence operated on the living, for or against them, or at least manifested themselves in ghostly apparitions.[5] Hence the rites that were frequently solemnised at the sepulchres of heroes bore a strong general resemblance to the ordinary cultus of the dead. The temples, or heroa, dedicated to them, were only

[1] Pausan. iii. 19.
[2] Diodor. *Fragm.* ed. Dindorf. p. 15; Herodot. v. 80.
[3] Zenob. *Adag.* v. 60; Babr. *Fab.* lxiii. 7.
[4] Clem. Alex. *ap. Euseb. Præp. Evang.* iv. 16. [5] Plut. *Thes.* xxxv.

sepulchral monuments. Enclosures, groves, and trees were consecrated to them. The altars on which they were sacrificed to, and the offerings as well, were distinct from those of the gods. At times the blood of the animals immolated was a kind of acceptable refreshment to the hero, —this at least seems to have been the original idea,—and was poured into a hole made at the side of the sepulchre, or into the sepulchre itself.[1] In later times, one could hardly distinguish between the service of the dead and the cultus of heroes; on the other hand, the line of demarcation between the cultus proper to the deities, and the honours allowed to heroes, was clearly drawn in most contingencies. Sometimes it happened that such sacrifices were offered to simple heroes as became gods only. The distance, then, between a hero and the Olympic deities could be passed; and cases occurred of persons who had been honoured as heroes being addressed as gods after some interval of time. Thus Orpheus was at first esteemed only a hero by the Thracians, and had but an heroön; which, however, became a temple, as he himself a god, when people began to venerate him with all the circumstance to which deities only were entitled.[2] Sacrifice was offered to Menelaus and Helen in Sparta, not as heroes but gods, no doubt on the ground of an apotheosis which had been going on gradually. The Phocæans offered heroic honours at first to Lampsace, the daughter of their king Mandron, but afterwards decreed to worship her as a goddess;[3] and Plutarch enters at length into the question, how the soul, when separated from the body, advances into the state of heroism, and from a hero becomes a demon, and from a demon a god.[4]

The most revered of all the heroes, and the common national one of the Greeks, was Heracles. He was inwoven in the traditional lore of all the Greek races and of the most considerable cities. As ancestor of a distinguished and ruling dynasty, he was, amongst heroes, what Zeus was amongst gods. To be descended from one or the other was esteemed the highest of distinctions. Around him Greek fancy massed the richest stores of its myths and

[1] Pausan. x. 4. 7.
[2] Conon, *Narr.* xlv.
[3] Plutarch, *de Virt. Mul.* vii. 43, ed. Reisk.
[4] *Romul.* xxviii.

sagas. He was represented as eminently the ideal of a persevering champion, who freed the earth of monsters and wild beasts, cleared the highways of banditti, stemmed the flow of rapid rivers, subdued tyrants, maintained the cause of the weak against the strong, of the ill-treated against their insolent oppressors, exterminated his enemies, and, after being doomed to endless toil for his neighbour, came out victorious from innumerable contests, until, as seal of his earthly career, he received the highest recompense of gratitude, divine blessedness and worship.

Heracles, throughout antiquity, was endowed with universality and almost omnipresence, in even a higher degree than most of the other deities. Through the whole of Asia, in Egypt and Libya, in all the countries known to the Greeks, from Gades as far as to Scythia, people could tell of him and his deeds. In him there was a Theban, or Attic, or Ætolian hero, with local colouring, and historical features supplied by the fortunes of his race, mixed up with the wandering god of the sun (Melkarth), to whom the Phenicians had erected temples in all their settlements on the Mediterranean, and also with the Lydo-Assyrian Heracles-Sandon, a sun-god, in like veneration as a king and leader of armies. It excited the astonishment of Herodotus to find Heracles generally in the East a primitive god, while the Greeks were only acquainted with him as a hero, who, alone of men, was translated to Olympus, or by his virtue had inherited apotheosis, *i.e.* a share in the bliss of the Olympic deities. Hence he thought those Hellenes took the best course, who had dedicated to Heracles temples and a cultus of both kinds—the one as to a god, the other as to a hero.[1]

Few even of the gods had so widely spread a worship among the Greeks as the hero Heracles; the whole of Hellas was filled with his temples. As helper in need, he was invoked in all kinds of difficulties. His principal distinction being that of an averter of harm, he was specially honoured as a deliverer from the scourge of destructive beasts,—at Æta in Thessaly, as the driver away of locusts, and, among the Erythræans, as destroyer of the wine-grub. But sacrifice was offered to him also as the

[1] Herodot. ii. 43 sqq.

bestower of victory and as god of armies.[1] At meal-times libations were made to him; and his name was frequently coupled with those of the great gods, Zeus, Athene, and Apollo. In Athens, where he first received divine honours, he was invoked as one of the mightiest of deities;[2] strangely contrasting with which position stood the opposite notion of his gluttony and love of drink, which the Greek comedy delighted in making prominent, and which was ever in the mouths of the people, and earned him a variety of opprobrious names, particularly on the score of voracity. These show it was frequently the case that people saw no more in him than the deified ideal of an athlete, super-abounding in physical strength, but of sluggish disposition and an enormous eater and drinker.

The Dioscuri, too, were combined and blended, both in myth and cultus, under the double aspect of the divine and the heroic, just as Heracles was. The old hero Tyndarus, the father of these brothers, or, if we follow some sagas, of one of them, was himself treated as a god in Lacedæmon.[3] But they, the sons of Leda, whose cultus the Dorians lighted upon in their migration into the Peloponnese, and whose worship had extended over the entire of Greece into Italy and Sicily, were afterwards to be met with in the place of the Cabiri, as "the great deities." Their brazen statues, as such, stood in the harbour at Samothrace; they were also interchanged with other local tutelary deities. It is hardly possible to determine whether the Tyndaridæ, from primitive Spartan deities of cosmical meaning, were first degraded to heroism, and afterwards, by association with the Samothracian Cabiri, again attained to divine honours;[4] or whether they were always only heroes, and the protection ascribed to them in storms at sea first gave occasion for their being interchanged with the Cabiri, who were similarly honoured as protectors of shipping.[5] The former, however, is the more credible supposition. In what is called St. Elmo's fire, showing itself in storms at mast-heads and on sails, people believed they discovered the presence of the Dioscuri. Then, according to a later

[1] Xenoph. *Anab.* iv. 8. 25.
[2] Eurip. *Herc. Fur.* 1331 sqq.
[3] Varro, *ap. Serv. ad Virg. Æn.* viii. 275.
[4] Welcker's *Æschyl. Trilogie*, 255 sqq.
[5] Ritter's *Mythologie*, ii. 71.

interpretation, they ought also to be placed in heaven as the constellation Gemini; and, like Heracles, moreover, they were at once patrons of the prize-ring and protectors of hospitality, sometimes condescending to visit in person, and be entertained in, the dwellings of a favoured few.

While we stop to take a survey of the entire province of Greek gods and heroes, an intricate labyrinth opens to our view, in which it would appear hard, nay almost impossible, for a single individual to strike the right path, —so great was the number of beings who laid claim to worship and honour, so manifold the contradictions between the myths and notions about these gods which received sanction from epic poetry, and were dignified into a popular credence on the one side, and the cultus of localities and sagas on the other. The confusion was enhanced by the circumstance, that the sphere of operation and the attributes of particular deities were wanting in accuracy and sharpness of outline in many particulars, or one god trenched upon the jurisdiction of another; so that, in numberless instances, doubt and disquietude necessarily arose as to which god precisely had to be propitiated or won over, and whether the passing-by of one or the other would not involve the consequence of his disfavour and revenge.

So long as Greek policy subsisted in the old fashion and in undiminished vigour, the service of the gods, both in its extent and its selection, as well as in the form determined upon by the tradition and laws of each several state, was the rule of conduct to the individual citizen, in which he acquiesced and founded his convictions. Hence, when the Delphic oracle was consulted upon the choice and manner of religious rites, the answer usually given referred them, as already mentioned, to the customs of their fatherland assigned to each for their guidance.[1] But when many cities of Greece took to the admission of a variety of strange religious rites, and when, along with the loss of their independence, respect for their ancient laws and traditions began to disappear, this barrier was perpetually being broken down, the old interdicts framed against the introduction of strange worship became more and more

[1] Xenoph. *Mem. Socr.* iv. 3. 16; cf. Cic. *de Legg.* ii. 16.

inoperative, and the desire gradually stronger to obtain more effectual help and favour, and more reliable means of averting the dangers that threatened, by the worship of new deities. Altars were actually erected to "unknown gods" in Athens and Olympia.

The number and variety of religious rites amongst the Greeks were chiefly results of the primitive history of the people and of their political organisation. The Greek states grew into shape from the corporate union of many families into clans, from clans into races, from races into the larger form of a political community, with an hereditary king for its head. As single families had their own rites, so also the clan and the race had theirs; and these all, by degrees, were thrown together into those of the state, and formed an association of supreme and subaltern deities.

To this result a long succession of migrations and foundings of colonies, since the year 1100 B.C., also contributed. Each immigration of a race brought with it, as a consequence, the multiplication of the religions already in possession of the country. The adventurers brought the deities of their race along with them from their old home, while they adopted, or at least tolerated, those already in existence in their new settlements. To reduce these several divinities into a connected whole, and to make the best of a genealogical affinity between old and new, to fill up the chasms resulting from this process, and to recompose the history of a race, or a cultus, in uniformity with that of a god,—such was the office of mythical poetry and invention; and it was thus that inextricable contradictions arose and remained inherent in the system. But no worship was considered objectionable or worthless by the Greeks on this ground. Whatever had once gained a position in the system, and had antiquity and descent on its side, was authorised, and was to be retained. If, therefore, a worship once obtained a local footing, it was sure to keep its ground, however great changes in the dominant race, the times, and institutions, there might be. It was only where a race or a family that had practised any particular cultus in an exclusive way died out or was lost, that the cultus and the memory of its deity disappeared along with it. It not unfrequently happened, that when

the primitive signification of a god and his worship underwent a change, the views and ways of life of a people determined the character of its deity; and thus agrarian deities must either have received another meaning, or have been pushed aside, in point of cultus and in the religious estimation of the people, under the domination of a race that shrunk from agriculture, and suffered its operations to be performed by slaves.

The Greeks had a number of primitive religious rites, contemporaneous with the first existence of their states, and growing with their growth,—rites which sometimes even the civilisation of the state had given the first impulse to, or at least had promoted; for instance, where particular communities, in the earliest times, joined an amphictyony, having a local sanctuary, with sacrifices and festivals in common, and out of this association the state grew, the prince of which was at the same time the priest of the deity. Here, then, were the gods of their fathers, whom the Greeks distinguished from the gods of their fatherland, *i.e.* all the gods canonically admitted into the community. The relation to these gods of their fathers was of the closest, when they were connected with the progenitors of the ruling race according to mythical tradition, and so had themselves given being to the old heroes and ancestors of the race or state. In this way the kings of Sparta descended, as Heraclids, from Heracles, and through him from Zeus himself; and Dorus too, the ancestor of the Dorians, was a son of Apollo by the Pythia.

Where, as in Thebes, Athens, and Sparta, a variety of races were thrown together into strong political union, an interchange of particular ancestral rites also took place among the different parties. Not unfrequently the origin of a particular cultus in a state was connected with, and owing to, the reception of a single foreign clan, who brought the cultus with them. It was thus the service of Aphrodite must have been introduced by Ægeus into Athens, and that of Dionysos by Pegasus into Eleutheræ.[1] Suppose a family raised itself to sovereign dignity, it invariably happened that their house-god, or their hereditary worship, met with a corresponding advancement, and was

[1] Pausan. i. 14. 6, i. 2. 4.

brought into general notice in the state. And so it would have been in the case of Isagoras, had he succeeded in forming a stable government at Athens, the cultus of the Carien Zeus, which was that of his clan, would undoubtedly have become a public one.[1]

There were many ways by which new religious rites derived from strangers were engrafted from time to time on the old and normal ones. An image of a deity, carried off by the victors from a conquered state, might prove a handle for hanging a new cultus upon; or the worship of a deity hitherto disregarded might, in consequence of a special occasion, sometimes too of a hint from an oracle, be decreed by the supreme authority of the state. Thus it was an oracle which enjoined the promotion of the cultus of Apollo Agyieus, and of Boreas, at Athens.[2] The very same deity was honoured, nevertheless, in different places after a different fashion. It was only where the cultus was based on original relationship of race, or where the colonies, which usually bound themselves to a rigorous conformity of ritual with their mother states, had followed exactly the type of the idol of the god, and the appearance of his temple on the spot, that the ceremonial services were also assimilated.[3]

The number of state deities was also gradually multiplied by the growing canonisation of abstractions, to which class belonged those nymphs in whom the idea of a state was personified, the cultus of a Sparta, Ægæa, Thebe, and Elis, and the priesthood of a goddess Rhodos on the island of that name.[4] The desire of standing well with stranger deities, as also of acquiring new protectors out of their own circle, was most strongly evinced in Athens; and this readiness on the part of the republic contributed essentially to its strength and prosperity. Thus, after the fight at Marathon, the cultus of Pan was introduced, as the belief was current, in accordance with the wish of the god; and not long after, the services of the Thracian deities, Cotytto and Bendis, experienced a welcome.[5]

Some rites remained the property of a community so

[1] Herodot. v. 66.
[2] Demosth. *adv. Mid.* 531. 9; Herodot. vii. 189.
[3] Strabo, p. 590 (?).
[4] Pausan. ii. 16. 8, v. 22. 5, vi. 16. 3.
[5] Herodot. vi. 105; Strabo, p. 470 (685, Oxf.); Plato, *de Rep.*, *init.*

exclusively as to prevent all who did not belong to it from participating in them. The very slaves of a household were often not allowed admittance into a family worship;[1] and, in a general way, the rites of a cultus were not unfrequently considered and kept as secrets of state; for people attributed to them a magical power of infallibly attracting the favour and help of the god to his worshippers, and were afraid lest others should succeed in acquainting themselves with and practising their rite, so as to detach the god from his former worshippers, and supplant them in the possession of his good graces. This apprehension, it is true, did not extend to a place or city which enjoyed the character of having fallen especially by lot to a deity as an inheritance, in which case the god would prefer being addressed by a title taken from the spot which was his own. The gods established the form and manner of their worship, either in person or by oracular response, or by sons and grandsons begotten of earthly mothers, and guided and counselled by themselves, or else by prophets enlightened and inspired for the purpose. The security for this service being preserved with reverence and in the integrity of its first divine institution, was, as people thought, the hereditary priesthood to whose care it was intrusted; and as a further warranty, the state itself, by law denouncing all mutilation of the ancient rite.

In glancing at the particular leading races and the states founded by them, which we must do in order to get an idea of the varieties of the established religious worship of the Greeks, the Achæan, that most genuine of Hellenic races, is the first to present itself; the Pelasgi having been noticed already. The Achæans had spread from Thessaly southwards, but, without having been destroyed by violence, were, to all appearance, almost extinct in Greece in the historical period, and, in part, had dropped out of existence under the name of Æolians. These Achæans were, of all the Greek races, the ministers *par excellence* of the Pelasgo-Dodonean Zeus, whom they had metamorphosed into Zeus Hellenios; then of the Argive Hera, and of Apollo Hylotes and Carneios. The divining art and expiation seem to have proceeded principally from out of this race.[2] Zeus

[1] Isæus, *de Ciron.* 16.

[2] Hesych. *Lex. v.* Ἀχαιομάντεις.

Homagyrios was the god in common of the later Achæan confederacy. In Ægium there was a Demeter Panachais, and an Athene of the same title at Patræ. The name of Æolians, not being an indication of an Hellenic race either in a political or family sense, but a collective designation for a medley of people, partially foreigners, in which the Æolian of northern and southern Greece, and the Asiatic Æolian too, are to be distinguished, it is hardly possible to specify the religious rites which may have belonged, as their own and their joint property, to the several races and countries comprised under it. The Bœotians, a leading Æolic race, on their migration from South Thessaly into the country called afterwards by their name, adored the Itonian Athene at Coronea (whom they had brought with them), as the federal Bœotian deity.[1] Dionysos and Apollo were the chief gods of Thebes; the latter had a famous sanctuary at Ismenium; the state sacrifice was offered to them both.[2] Platææ, on the other hand, worshipped Hera Teleia; and Eros was the leading god at Thespiæ.

In remote antiquity, the Dorians, originally a powerful and pure Hellenic mountain tribe, were but a branch of the Achæan race. As they were dominant in the Peloponnese, from the time of their Heracleid expedition, the cultus they and the tribes allied to them by descent shared in common consisted of the worship of Zeus, Apollo, and Athene, and of the deified hero of their race, Heracles. In Sparta, the Delphian Apollo was the real state god proper, and to him their kings sacrificed twice a month.[3] Athene, the goddess of the citadel of Sparta, had more temples in Laconia than perhaps any other deity; while Artemis was honoured under the greatest variety of attributes and titles. The Argive Hera had been naturalised here, to say nothing of Aphrodite, Dionysos, and Ares. They had a temple of Death, of Laughter, and Terror, and a larger number of heroes to worship than any other of the Hellenic states.

In Messenia, Zeus Ithometes was worshipped as the god of the country; the chief religious rites were those of Demeter and Coré. Argos, as her birthplace and inheritance, served Hera, that eminently Pelasgic goddess; and

[1] Strabo, p. 411 (597, Oxf.); Pausan. ix. 34. 1.
[2] Pausan. iv. 27. 4.
[3] Herodot. vi. 57.

yet Apollo was also the real state god there, and next to him the Nemean Zeus and Heracles. In Phlius, Hebé, or Dia, was the object of supreme worship. The ancient Trœzen and Hermione were peculiarly rich in religions; in the former, the triple Artemis worship, in the latter the mystery rite of Demeter and Coré, were the prevalent ones. Dionysos was supreme in Sicyon, though Apollo, in fact, enjoyed still greater reverence there. At Corinth, Poseidon and Helios, into whose place Aphrodite succeeded, divided possession between them as by convention.[1] In the colonies of Doric origin, again, Apollo was the god who had the most temples and rites—five, for instance, at Byzantium. Many of these appear to have had no worship of Zeus at all.

The Ionians, accounted as Pelasgi by the ancients, and called Pelasgi of the Aigialos, or coast, in their first settlement, the northern seabeach of Peloponnese, migrated from thence into Attica, and thence again, from excess of population, made a further settlement in Asia Minor, and were in possession of Attica, Eubœa, the Cyclades, and the Ionian coast of Asia Minor. With them, in particular, the method of fusing barbaric and Hellenic elements in their deities prevailed. The service of Poseidon, who was, on the whole, a stranger to the Achæans and Dorians, was a property of the Ionians, and they of Asia Minor especially recognised him as their federal god; and to him the Pan-Ionion at Mycale was consecrated by the twelve Ionian cities.[2] Athene, nevertheless, was, and continued to be, the Ionian family goddess proper, next to whom in estimation came Apollo Patroos, whose son was admitted to be the mythical personification of the race. Athens, the Ionian capital, was the real home and birthplace of the double goddess Pallas Athene, and here her worship predominated. She was possessor of the soil, which was her portion, and which Poseidon was obliged to resign to her after a contest, implying that her worship had been victorious over his.[3] The cultus of Athene Ergane was peculiar to Athens. Her most renowned sanctuaries were the temple of Athene

[1] Pausan. ii. 1. 6, ii. 4. 7.
[2] Herodot. i. 148; Strabo, pp. 384, 639 (557, 916, Oxf.).
[3] Plutarch, *Themist.* xix.; Plat. *Critias*, p. 109 c.

Polias, with its ancient image, that had fallen from heaven, in the Acropolis; the Parthenon, specially designed for the brilliant Panathenaic festival; and the Palladium in the lower city, with the armed image of the goddess, pretended to have been taken from Troy. The worship of the "sublime goddesses" Demeter and Persephone, with its festivals and richly endowed sanctuary, was of hardly inferior import in an estimate of Athens and her religious opinions.

Zeus Hypatos, or "highest," was worshipped at Athens in an unbloody rite without a temple, before the Erechtheum consecrated to Athene. But, as Olympios, he had his far-famed temple first completed by Hadrian, with its colossal images; and as Polieus, or protector of the state, he had his own festivals dedicated to him. The worship of Apollo surpassed that of Zeus in variety. He was adored as the Pythian, Delphian, and Lycian god, as Aguieus according to the oracle's bidding, and as god of the Ionian race, Patroos. Athens besides, as metropolis of the Ionians, had appropriated the conduct and ceremonial of the Delian solemnities.[1] Artemis appeared here, too, in many forms, and had her temples and votaries, as Brauronia of Tauris, as Munychia goddess of the harbour, as goddess of the chase, or Agrotera, to whom the victory at Marathon was owing, and as goddess of births (Chitone). Themistocles had erected a temple to her as Aristobule, and she also required a worship as Pheræa.

Hera was held in no esteem at Athens; only in the way to Phalerum stood a Hera temple, without door or roof.[2] On the other hand, the city was headquarters of the worship of Hephæstos. Homage was paid to Hermes by numberless ithyphallic Hermæ, placed all about, without his having a temple. Aphrodite, however, had a number of temples and sanctuaries, partly on account of her manifold attributes, partly because, since Solon's time, the inclination to erect new sanctuaries to the goddess of impurity, with a corresponding cultus, sought expression in a variety of ways. With the primeval rites of the Phenician Aphrodite Urania, those of the also Phenician Adonis were connected. The Pandemos, who from a community

[1] Thucyd. iii. 104, i. 96; Strabo, p. 485 (709, Oxf.); Pausan. iv. 4. 1.
[2] Pausan. i. 1. 4.

goddess had been converted into a patroness of haunts of impurity, had a temple consecrated to her by Solon. Not less impure was the worship offered to her in her far-famed temple in the neighbourhood of the promontory of Colias. We must add to these the Aphrodite temple built by Demetrius and Harpalus, in reality to honour their paramours,[1] and in Peiræus, erected by Conon in thanksgiving for his naval victory at Cnidus.

The worship of Poseidon continued long in the shade. He was obliged to content himself with an altar, also used for sacrifice to the mythical king Erechtheus;[2] only games were celebrated in his honour in the Peiræus. Dionysos, on the contrary, was a favourite and much-frequented god, having three temples and a triple worship corresponding,—a country, a city, and an Eleusinian one, each with brilliant festivals. Ares had a temple. Hestia enjoyed the honour of a seat in the Prytaneum; and even the pre-Hellenic divinities, Gé, Cronos, and Rhea, had temples and feasts here; so too the Furies, who, except in Attica, were only venerated at two other places in Greece besides. The Asiatic mother of the gods had her celebrated temple, the Metroön, in which were kept the state records. Lastly, Prometheus, owned in the Academy, and hardly anywhere else in the whole of Hellas, a sanctuary, with a torch-race established in his honour. Besides these there was a cultus of the Cabiri Anakes, of the Hours, of Asclepios, of Themis, of the Charites, of the goddess of victory, and of the goddess of births, Ilithuia; to these, in process of time, in consequence of enlargement of the franchise, the worship of the Arcadian Pan, of the Thracian deities Cotytto and Bendis, and Serapis, were added. The demonic personifications of Compassion, of Shame, Rumour, and Endeavour, had altars. In short, the city, from the multitude of gods, and the splendour of their temples and festivals (double in number when compared with those of other Greeks), seems to have been insatiably greedy of perpetual novelty in the article of deities and religious rites. On the other hand, the number of heroes was more limited, and they mostly belonged to the ancient history of the city in old Pelasgic times. The real national hero was Theseus. Codrus,

[1] Athen. vi. 253, xiii. 595.

[2] Pausan. i. 26. 6.

Academus, Solon, and the enemies of despotism, Harmodius and Aristogeiton, were added afterwards. Heracles, as god, enjoyed extensive honours.

In the remaining Ionian states and colonies, Apollo, Artemis, and Dionysos were the most frequently met with; less so Athene, Demeter, and Poseidon, and Aphrodite also. The Cyclades were followers partly of Apollo, partly of Dionysos. Here and there Zeus was worshipped, and Juno was mistress in Samos.

In Thessaly, the land of the Pelasgic race, the old federate worshippers of Zeus Peloros (the mighty), of Demeter, of the Delphian Apollo, and of Poseidon Petræos, prevailed even after the Thesprotian conquest. Asclepios was in esteem in Tricca; at Pharsalos, the sea-goddess Thetis had the only temple consecrated to her. The cultus of Apollo was the prevalent one in Phocis, Ætolia, and Acarnania.

A very important centre of the religious system of the Greeks was the little plain of Olympia, with the holy grove Attis, in the neighbourhood of the city of Elis, the arena for the joint celebration of all the Hellenic games. Nowhere else were so many splendid buildings and sanctuaries to be found collected together in so small a space as in this sacred enclosure. Here stood the temple of the Olympic Zeus, almost equal in size to the Parthenon, adorned with the most magnificent and beautiful work of Hellenic sculpture—the image of Zeus by Phidias, wrought of ivory and gold. Next, the hero temple, with its rich treasure of costly votive gifts, and the metroön of the mother of the gods, in which was contained the series of the treasure-houses of each Greek state, with their votive offerings. To Ilithuia, and Demeter Chameune, and Heracles, sacrifice was offered in their own temples; to Cronos, under the open sky. The enclosure contained besides a number of altars, on which the Eleians sacrificed monthly to Hestia, and then to Zeus, under the six several predicates of the supreme, the hurler of lightning, the purifier, the house-protector (Herceios), the Chthonic or underground, and the superior of the goddesses of fate. The same took place for Artemis, the river-god Alphæos, for Apollo, Heracles, Gé, and the unknown deities.

In Arcadia, as already mentioned, the old Pelasgic cultus was maintained in its purest state. Artemis Hymnia was the special object of reverence.[1] Next to her we may specify Demeter and her daughter Athene Alea, the Lycæan Zeus, Poseidon, Hermes, and Pan. Here and there Dionysos was worshipped. The cultus of Apollo was not to be found in the generality of the Arcadian towns. Nevertheless, near Cyllene, and in Lycosura, which claimed to be the oldest town of Hellas, homage was paid to the Pythian god; and in Mantinea, Leto and her children had a worship. The cultus of Apollo Aguieus probably only reached Tegea because of its close connection with Sparta. Even Hera and Aphrodite were not to be met with in most places; they could not thrive in the vicinity of Artemis. The former was honoured in Stymphalus only; the latter in the neighbourhood of Phigalia, in Tegea, and the little town of Teuthis. Megalopolis, as the youngest of all the Hellenic cities, was distinguished from other places in Arcadia by a more comprehensive religious system, formed under the influences of the rest of Greece.[2]

In Crete, Zeus held the first place of all. Here he was born in a cave of Mount Ida, as was believed not only in Crete, but all over Greece. Here the nymphs fed him on milk and honey, and the Curetes drowned his infantile cries with the clash of their sword-dance. Here they showed his cradle and his grave, for it was here too he died. Thus Crete was the favourite island of Zeus, as Delos was of Apollo. Dionysos had also worship here. The cultus of Apollo reached the island through the Dorian migration; and he, not indeed the son of Zeus, but of Corybas, was said to have contended with Zeus for the possession of the island.[3] The worship of Britomartis and Dictynna was peculiar to the island, particularly amongst the people of Cydonia; the two were identical, though separated in local cultus. Originally a goddess of shipping and fishermen, which the name Dictynna also indicates, Britomartis came to be associated with Artemis in consequence of the Doric settlement, and was converted into a nymph, beloved by that

[1] Pausan. viii. 5. 7.
[2] *Ibid.* viii. 30. 1, 31. 6, 32. 1–3.
[3] Cic. *N. D.* iii. 23.

goddess, till at last she was identified with her as daughter of Leto.[1]

In Cyprus, where Greek intellect and national characteristics had overpowered the older Phenician and Phrygian elements, the religious and mystical system all wore Greek colours. Aphrodite was the territorial deity of the island, and was honoured at Amathus as an hermaphrodite Aphroditos, wearing a beard, but in female attire. Salamis was headquarters of the Zeus worship; human sacrifice, introduced there by Teucer, did not terminate till the time of Hadrian.[2] Hera, Demeter, Dionysos, Apollo, and Athene were also worshipped on the island; and Agraulos as well, a daughter of the Athenian Cecrops, to whom, in earlier times, a man was sacrificed.

The result of this geographical survey of the extensive province of the Hellenic religious system is this, that the temples and worship of Zeus prove by no means so numerous as one would have expected from the dignity and importance attributed to him generally as sovereign ruler of the world. The worship of Apollo was far more widely spread; for instance, Byzantium having five temples of his, and not one of Zeus. In the same way, among the female divinities, the cultus of Artemis appears to have been much more frequent than that of Hera. Possibly even Demeter and Athene had both of them more numerous services and sanctuaries than the consort of the ruler of the world.

The superior deities were also clubbed together in a common cultus; for there were temples consecrated to no particular deity, but to the twelve gods in common. At Thelpusa in Arcadia[3] there was a sanctuary of the twelve deities (probably the Olympic), but sacred, indeed, besides to Asclepios; and at Megara there were images of the eleven other gods in the temple of Artemis Soteira. The market-place, which in the Athenian cities was also a focus of sanctuaries, appears, at least in similar cases, to have had in the middle of it an altar dedicated to the twelve gods, and sometimes to have contained images of them too.[4]

[1] Pausan. ii. 30. 3; Callimach. *Hymn. in Dian.* 189; Eurip. *Iphig. Taur.* 126.

[2] Lactant. *de Falsâ Relig.* i. 21.

[3] Pausan. viii. 25. 3.

[4] Aristot. *Polit.* vii. 9. 1–4.

This is an ascertained fact of Athens and Eleusis. The Agora of the gods in the former city became proverbial.[1] At Xanthos in Lycia there stood in the market-place a monument of victory, dedicated to "the twelve."[2] Even in harbour towns such altars are frequently mentioned; and when people alluded to a court or assemblage of the gods, it was these twelve they meant, and their images, sumptuously arrayed, which were borne by hand or in carriages at festal processions, at least at a later period.[3] Corinth had even a pantheon, a temple consecrated to all the gods; and at Hierothusion in Messenia statues of all the Hellenic gods were erected; and the thirty square stones lying in the market-place at Pharæ in Achaia, and reverenced by the inhabitants as so many distinct gods,[4] ought also to be reckoned. There were nameless deities besides, whether from their names being kept secret, or because no one knew them. Thus there were the "pure" deities of the Acropolis at Pallantium,[5] before whom the most sacred oaths were sworn; and "the placable deities," to whom a cultus was appointed at Myonia in Locris.[6]

So fertile was the Greek genius in the congregation of its divine beings, that here and there there were gods and rites which only existed at one single place, and which no one thought worth the trouble of borrowing or copying. This was the case with regard to the Praxidikæ of Haliartos in Bœotia, who were there honoured as goddesses of oaths, represented in images as mere heads, and having a sacrifice of heads of beasts offered to them. At the citadel in Rhodes, Plutos, or Wealth, was worshipped, who appeared elsewhere only as a child in the arms of Tyché, or, as in Athens, of the goddess of peace. Traces of a worship of Night are only to be found amongst the Megarians, who had an oracle of this goddess.[7] In Trœzen reverence was paid to Sleep, in company with the Muses, and an altar was dedicated to the Themides, who were elsewhere known only as a single goddess. The Tritopatores at Athens were also unknown to the rest of

[1] Hesych. *θεῶν ἀγορά*: cf. Steph. *Thes. s.v. ἀγορά*.
[2] Boeckh, *Corp. Inscr.* 4268.
[3] *E.g.* Diodor. xvi. 92.
[4] Pausan. vii. 22. 1.
[5] *Ibid.* viii. 44. 5.
[6] Θεοὶ μειλίχιοι,—Pausan. x. 38. 4.
[7] *Ibid.* i. 40. 5.

Hellas, and seem to have become strange and unintelligible to the Athenians themselves at a later period. They were held to be wind-gods; also to have been the first made beings of creation, and again deities of marriage and birth.[1] In Corinth not only the Cyclops had a temple, but Bia and Ananke (Force and Necessity) had theirs, which, however, could not have been much frequented; and in Messene there was a holy house dedicated to the Curetes, those ambiguous beings who, according to the best informed, were ministering demons of the mother of the gods, but whom Hesiod had already styled deities.[2]

After Alexander's time, a new importation of foreign deities was added to the host of old domestic ones. Every little country town now had a temple of foreign gods. Thus, Pausanias saw a temple of Isis at Ceryneia in Achaia. Images of Serapis and of Isis stood in Ægira, and the Syrian goddess had a temple which could not be entered without submitting to purifications first. Isis had as many as two temples in Corinth, the one dedicated to her as Pelagia, the other as Ægyptia: the same was the case with Serapis. Temples were erected here even to the Roman Jupiter Capitolinus, and to Octavia, sister of Augustus.[3]

If we survey the Greek universe of gods as regards the duties and sphere of action attributed to them, it is clear that the creative imagination of the Greeks, far surpassing the poverty of other nations in such matters, and the eastern in particular, had given birth to a grandly organised whole, in which each god had his vocation assigned to him; each department of nature and of human life, each branch of human effort and operation, had a tutelary deity to preside over it. The weather, sunshine, and rain were immediately subject to the disposition of Zeus; Demeter provided for the fertility of the soil. Countless nymphs of field and spring and stream showered their gifts. The grape and its juice were intrusted to Dionysos, and Poseidon was the sovereign of the sea. The flocks and herds had their protectors in Hermes and Pan. The

[1] Pausan. i. 40. 5|; Lobeck, *Aglaopham.* 753. 55.
[2] Pausan. iv. 31. 6; Hesiod, *Fragm.* l. 32 (quoted by Strabo, x. 687, Oxf.).
[3] Pausan. ii. 3. 4.

goddess of fate specially ruled the destinies of men. Kings and authorities saw in Zeus their type and their guardian; Athene held her shield over cities. The public and domestic hearth were in the hands of Hestia. To marriage the favour and providence of Hera were assured. Legislation was confined to Demeter. Mothers commended themselves to the keeping of Artemis or Ilithuia. Music, skill in archery, and soothsaying were Apollo's attributes; the healing art was under the tutelage of himself and his son Asclepios. In war, Athene was invoked, and Mars controlled. The chase was placed under the inspection of Artemis. The operations of the smithy and all who wrought by fire found a patron in Hephæstos; whilst Athene Ergane presided over the softer works, and Hecate guarded the highways.

BOOK III

THE MYSTERIES AND THE ORPHIC RELIGIOUS DOCTRINE

In the Greek world there were a variety of mysteries collateral to that public worship of the gods which was practised before the eyes of all. Some of these were recognised by the state authorities, and were placed under the protection of the laws; others were but tolerated, or passed over without notice. Many of these institutions were only distinguishable from the ordinances of public cultus by the accidental form of mystery and concealment. It might happen that a service, which at an earlier period had been public, fell into obscurity, as a consequence of the fortunes of the race to whose care it was committed; or in order to the better preservation of its exclusive character of limitation to one family, or, generally speaking, to a narrower circle. But there were mysteries too, and those just the most important, which formed a contrast to the Hellenic worship in its public and political aspect.

This opposition is not, however, to be looked for in a secret theology or metaphysical doctrine, contravening the expositions of the public religion, and which was to be communicated under the seal of silence. People indeed have represented the case as if it were a matter of secret doctrine, hereditary in and propagated by particular families of priests and theologians, and which had to be resorted to as an explanatory commentary upon symbolical actions and exhibitions,—a kind of monotheistic teaching, by which the prevalent errors of the popular

polytheism were to be corrected. That, however, is not to be thought of; the sacerdotal families who were charged with the custody and representation of the mysteries, as, for example, the Eumolpidæ at Athens, were as little of teachers or preachers as the other ministers of Hellenic worship; and, besides, the propagation and tradition of mystical lore, destructive of the prevailing religious creed, was a thing which the Greek states (punishing as they did with death every attack on that belief) would never have tolerated for an instant, much less have taken under their special protection. There was no exposition of doctrine in the mysteries, and no course of dogmatical instruction; the address was not made to the understanding, but to the sense, the imagination, and the divining instincts of the initiated. And if in this way he carried off any instruction, if he was enriched with a store of conceptions to which he had been hitherto a stranger, concerning divine things and his own destiny, as dependent on the divine will, assuredly what was so acquired was but indirect and symbolical, though just as certainly it had, in its degree, a very considerable effect, and left a deep impression behind.

For the whole was a drama, the prelude to which consisted in purifications, sacrifices, and injunctions with regard to the behaviour to be observed. The adventures of certain deities, their sufferings and joys, their appearance on earth, and relations to mankind, their death, or descent to the nether world, their return, or their rising again,—all these, as symbolising the life of nature, were represented in a connected series of theatrical scenes. These representations, tacked on to a nocturnal solemnity, brilliantly got up, particularly at Athens, with all the resources of art and sensual beauty, and accompanied with dancing and song, were eminently calculated to take a powerful hold on the imagination and the heart, and to excite in the spectators alternately conflicting sentiments of terror and calm, sorrow, and fear, and hope. They worked upon them, now by agitating, now by soothing, and meanwhile had a strong bearing upon susceptibilities and capacities of individuals, according as their several dispositions inclined them more to reflection and observation, or to a resigned credulity.

Hence all that was generally put forward in the mysteries might be reduced to "things exhibited, things done, and things spoken." The things exhibited, to wit, were certain objects, symbols, or relics, given out as being particularly sacred. The things done and represented by imitation were the acts and adventures of the gods, inclusive of sacrifices and purifications. The things spoken were partly the so-called "holy legends," in each of which a mythical event—something done or suffered by a deity —was conveyed by way of illustrating a symbol or a rite; partly liturgical formulæ, and short enigmatical exclamations, relating to the occurrences represented, in which, moreover, prayers, hymns, and songs must be included. The mysteries, then, were certainly based on a doctrine, or some doctrine or other was involved in them, and could be practically deduced from them, though of course in very different ways. Still this doctrine was not put forward as such; it was partly hypothesis, and in part it lay veiled under the symbols exhibited in the histories of the gods represented, and in the formulæ of the prayers; and it was left to each individual's own judgment and degree of enlightenment to interpret these things as he would. The mystagogues, that is, the Athenian citizens who were charged to help stranger Greeks as assistants and guides in the initiation, also gave them instructions how they were to act, or explanations of what had preceded; but wherever they went beyond their own private sources of knowledge, or actual fact and the symbolical veil, all was but presumption and attempt at private interpretation.

This is the only plausible way the testimony of the ancients, and the vast variety of their opinions upon the dogmatical purport of the mysteries, admit of being reconciled. They say the initiated had nothing to learn, but only impressions to receive, and to place themselves in a certain disposition for which they were prepared.[1] No convincing by principles found place in the mysteries. Nothing was imparted that might determine the intellect to a believing reception.[2] People were to reflect thoughtfully, under the guidance of philosophical discernment,

[1] Aristot. *ap. Synes. Orat.* p. 48, Petav.

[2] Plutarch, *de Def. Orac.* vol. vii. 664, ed. Reisk.

upon what was here done and spoken.[1] Galen draws out the contrast between the perfect brightness imparted by nature to the discerning mind, and the obscureness of the instruction aimed at in the mysteries;[2] and it was already said in the Homeric hymn, "Man must neither pass by nor investigate these matters."[3]

A trait of mysteriousness penetrates the whole of the Greek religious system. Everywhere occurred things which were to remain hidden, with which only the priests, or a narrow circle, were acquainted; thus there were secret names of deities, secret sacrifices, secret forms of invocation. The women had their hidden rites, which were neither to be seen or known of men. There were also "holy legends," which illustrated certain peculiarities of the deities, as exhibited, or of the cultus, and which people might sometimes learn of the priest, though they were ordinarily concealed; for example, the meaning of the pomegranate, which the image of Hera at Mycenæ bore in its hand, or the imageless festival, with which the Phliasians fêted Hera.[4] Such secret sagas mostly contained something local, and contradictory to the common mythological notion, or pointed to some obscene circumstance regarding the deity. There were temples which always remained closed, as that of Aphrodite Urania at Ægira,[5] and groves which no foot dared approach.[6] Again, there were many temples only accessible to priests, such as that of Apollo Carneios at Sicyon, and Artemis at Pellene;[7] others were not to be entered by women, as the sanctuary of Aphrodite Acræa in Cyprus;[8] whereas the temple of Dionysos at Bryseæ in Laconia was closed to men, and only women could perform a secret sacrificial rite there, carefully guarded from the eyes of men.[9] Temples of Demeter were mostly open to women only, and generally men were forbidden to enter a Thesmophorion, or sanctuary consecrated to Demeter.[10] Many images of the gods, too, were kept out of sight, and only open to priests, or were exhibited but once in the year in a nocturnal procession, as

[1] Plutarch, *de Iside*, c. lxviii. [2] *De Usu Partium*, vii. 14; *Opp.* vii. 469.
[3] *Hymn. in Demetr.* v. 481 (478, Wolf. Oxf.).
[4] Pausan. ii. 17. 4, 13. 3. [5] *Ibid.* vii. 26. 3. [6] *Ibid.* viii. 31. 2.
[7] *Ibid.* vii. 27. 1, viii. 36. 2. [8] Strabo, p. 682 (971, Oxf.).
[9] Pausan. iii. 20. 4. [10] Teles. *ap. Stob.* p. 232 (ii. 82, Gaisford).

the statues at Sicyon.[1] Sacrifices that were deemed of special power were frequently performed in profound stillness and concealment at night-time, or with closed doors. Such were the sacrifices offered to the Lycæan Zeus in Arcadia, and to Hera at Mycenæ. If a sacrifice of this kind was further combined with rites and symbolic actions peculiar to itself, then the whole, as of itself, assumed the form of the celebration of a mystery. The same is true of the plays and games celebrated at night in honour of a deity; and Plutarch, in fact, observes of games of the kind sacred to Melicerta, they had more the character of a mystery rite than of theatrical representation and public festal procession.[2]

Let us then make a further distinction of things which the ancients did not always keep duly separate. There were secret rites, in which sacrifices principally had to be offered with peculiar observances, and images of deities kept under lock and key had to be disclosed and unveiled to a few, or to persons of one sex; and there were mystery institutions. The former particularly gave rise to the expectation of a powerful effect from them, which effect, as men fancied, the deity was not able to deprive them of. The latter, the mystery institutes proper, were in part a service consecrated to certain deities, or consisted of a succession of religious functions; but at the same time must have disclosed to those who were prepared for it a new aspect of the deity, of which they had hitherto been ignorant, and so have produced a lasting religious impression on them. This distinction is of particular importance in the question of the nature of the mystic rites (τελεταί) of Dionysos. It will be shown afterwards there were really secret rites of that god, but by no means independent Dionysiac mysterics, absolutely speaking, in which a peculiar religious doctrine was mythically represented and conveyed. Dionysos was only a mystery-god in connection with other deities and under a different designation.

There was, in fact, a strong line of demarcation between the deities when viewed in relation to the mysteries. The gods of the popular belief are beings of poetic creation, entirely anthropomorphic, and extracted from nature: part

[1] Pausan. ii. 7. 6. [2] Plutarch, *Thes.* xxv.

of them retire quite into obscurity in the mysteries, while the rest show themselves in the light and with the mythical adjuncts of the old nature-gods. Demeter, Coré, and Dionysos were mystery deities proper, not indeed universally and according to their whole essence, but Demeter, Dionysos, and probably Hermes too, pre-eminently so in their relation to death and the lower world, a relation which existed in the instances of Coré and Hecate anyhow. Zeus was only a mystery-god in Crete, and nowhere else. Hera, Athene, Apollo, and Poseidon had no qualifications for that character, and, granting the service of Hera at Argos was a secret one, with a legend which was kept secret, and that a secret solemnity was observed in honour of the Charites at Athens,—these were assuredly remains of an old pre-Hellenic cultus, thrust aside by the latter system, and therefore not dovetailing into it exactly,—a cultus wherein the old signification of the goddesses had been obliterated from the mind of men in general.

An examination of the views and expressions the Greeks and Romans have left behind them for our use, respecting the mysteries, shows that, far from imparting a solid teaching, with precise formulæ, these institutes were much more calculated for leaving a wide field for conjecture and the play of the imaginative powers of the mystæ; some of whom, without drawing further dogmatic conclusions, contented themselves with the immediate impressions of the histories of the gods represented, and with the hopes thrown out in them of a life of bliss after death; while others always referred what they saw and heard to the standard of their preconceived notions, and were widely divided in their estimate of the lessons contained under the symbolical veil of the mysteries.

If we distinguish the expressions and views of Greeks, Romans, and Christians concerning the substance, value, and effects of the mysteries, there appears at first sight an irreconcilable contradiction, not only between the heathen and the Christian statements, but also between those of the heathen Greeks themselves. Yet many an apparent contradiction is solved, if only we discriminate duly between the mysteries themselves, namely, the Samothracian, and those private mysteries which came

from abroad, the Eleusinian and Orphic. The Eleusinian were thought most highly of in antiquity, and were sometimes represented as the real flower of the Hellenic religion, and as containing the best, purest, and noblest of what Greece had to offer in a religious point of view. Besides, we must not overlook the fact that the Eleusinian festivals and mysteries were an institute of the Athenian state, and that the orators on whom it devolved to panegyrise the Athenian republic and people, would naturally exalt this institution as one of the jewels of the Athenian diadem, and glorify it with the cream of their rhetoric; and that, in a word, the lustre which the intellectual supremacy of Athens, her rich literature and poetry, and her artistic perfection, shed over all that was there done and practised, would also reflect upon the Eleusinian mysteries.

Thus it is first of all the orator Isocrates who in his panegyric [1] praises the two blessings of Demeter, the fruits of the field and the initiation rites, and then enhances the operation of the latter in regard to the brighter hopes of life and its conclusion, which the initiated derived from them. This is the passage which Cicero had before his eyes when he counted the mysteries of Ceres as the most excellent product of Athens, inasmuch as mortal men were first raised thereby from a crude, peasant existence to the dignity of real civilisation, and had not only learnt cheerfulness in life, but also a better hope in dying.[2] In a like sense spoke the poets,—the author of the Homeric hymns, Pindar, and Sophocles, that the destinies of the initiate in the lower world would be entirely distinct from those of the uninitiated; only those who knew life's source and object were to be sharers in bliss there,[3] whilst the rest were to be lost in mire and filth. In particular, the sweeping denunciation of Sophocles,[4] the most religious of the Greek poets, seems to have made the very greatest impression: Plutarch asserts that he filled many myriads of souls with despondency by it; surely he also impelled many, by a participation in the mysteries, to secure themselves that consolation for the

[1] Isocr. iv. 29. [2] Cic. *de Legg.* ii. 14.

[3] Pind. *Fragm.* 102; *Poetæ Lyrici*, ed. Bergk, p. 253; Sophocl. *Fragm. ap. Plutarch de. aud. Poet.*

[4] Soph. *Fragm.* 719; *Poet. Scen. Græc.* ed. Dindorf.

other side of the grave.[1] Yet the comic poet Philetairos, and in Athens too, dared by parody to make a mock of the poet's glowing promises of bliss, and of the hierophant's as well: "Pretty is it to die to the music of the flute, for such only are allowed in Hades to indulge in love."[2]

The first thing that presents itself, on the other hand, is the pregnant silence, or the significant disapprobation and contempt, of the philosophers. If the philosopher Prodicus, who lived at Athens in the time of Socrates, derived all mysteries, and even all worship of the gods, from agriculture merely,[3] there undoubtedly lies beneath that view the denial, on his part, of all deeper import and value in the Eleusinia, as was very much the case also with the Romans, Varro and Cotta. If Socrates had spoken ever a word in recommendation of the Eleusinian mysteries, so highly esteemed in his parent state, as certainly would it have been preserved; for nothing would have better established in the eyes of his fellow-citizens the groundlessness of the charge which led him to execution; and it was entirely owing to the insulting mockery of the mysteries by his pupil Alcibiades, that the suspicion of irreverence came to fall upon himself. People tried to explain his doubtless intentional silence upon the hypothesis of his not having been initiated; but this is only grounded on a misinterpretation of the expression of Lucian.[4]

Still more significant is the attitude Plato has maintained towards the mysteries,—Plato, to whom in his writings the occasion must so frequently have presented itself of mentioning generally the explanations there given, or the advantages promised, and who besides expresses himself so decidedly upon the maintenance of the state religion in all its aspects, and the reverence due to the priest class. Notwithstanding, we find in his works not only no favourable expression anywhere regarding the Eleusinia, but positive blame. For if he reproves the confidence which people were wont to place in the power of the mysteries (τελεταί), "affirmed even by the greatest

[1] *De aud. Poet.* 21. t. vi. 56, Reisk.; cf. Aristoph. *Ran.* 457.
[2] *Ap. Athen.* p. 633 F.
[3] Themist. *Or.* xxx. 349 A.
[4] *Demonax*, xi. (v. 237, ed. Bip.).

states," to expiate sins and injustices for this life and the other,[1] and if he paints the ruinous consequences of this error in the destruction of all sense of righteousness, it is clear that his mind is primarily running upon Athens and its state mysteries, the Eleusinian; Athens, moreover, was the only one of the more important Greek states that had a mystery institute of the kind. The same disapprobation is clear as daylight from another passage of the same treatise, where Plato complains that scandalous stories of the gods were put before all "who sacrificed a swine"; in other words, all who were initiated in the Eleusinia.[2] Only when he propounds his opinion of the migration of souls, does he appeal to the old dogmas of the priests;[3] but even there he is not alluding to the Eleusinia, in which this doctrine was not brought forward, but to the Orphico-Dionysiac mysteries, from which it had been already transferred into the writings of the poets. There are other ways still in which Plato's dislike to the mysteries peeps out; for example, where he is describing the migration of souls into new bodies, according to the degree of their education. Such of these as have been occupied in divination and the mysteries he fixes in the fifth class only.[4] Again, when ridiculing the mystery poets, he exclaims, "What better recompense can they give to virtue than an eternity of intoxication!" Lastly, when, with a significant side-hit at the state mysteries, he says that the most perfect of mysteries are those which the philosopher celebrates while he revels in the recollection of that which he has seen in a former existence with God.[5]

Of the later writers, the view which Plutarch in particular held of the mysteries ought to be of the greatest weight. His strong religious feeling, and his industry in sifting every department of the then religious system, do not admit of indifference towards these institutions being presumed in him. He too attaches to the mysteries the hope, or the certainty, of a life after death. He directed his own wife to the Dionysia for consolation when mourning over the death of her daughter: from them they knew that

[1] Plato, *de Repub.* ii. 8, p. 73. [2] Plat. *Rep.* ii. 17, p. 95.
[3] *Meno.* p. 81; *Legg.*, *Opp.* ix. pp. 870–872.
[4] *Phædr.* p. 248 D. [5] *Ibid.* p. 249 D.

the soul still has life and feeling after death.[1] He may have been there alluding to the Lernæan or Delphic mystic rite, or even to the petty mysteries in Agræ; it is not probable he meant the private initiation of the Orphica. How little value he attached to the real Eleusinia is shown by his taking Ceres and Proserpine to be goddesses, the one of the earth, and the other of the moon, and putting an astronomical interpretation on their destiny and wanderings in accordance with it;[2] and further by his assertion that the mysteries were only a contrivance of the ancients to habituate people to silence in matters of civil life through the reserve imposed in religious matters.[3] In fine, he declared the mysteries to contain the strongest proofs that the deities, whose adventures were there represented, were not gods proper, but ministering demons, or partly good and partly bad genii, whose only office it was to execute the behests of the gods;[4] and his reference to the wanderings of Demeter and the obscene stories, shows it was really the Eleusinia he had in view when so speaking. On the other hand, others whom Diodorus mentions had either heard it reported from the mysteries, or inferred from them, that Demeter was nothing else but the "mother earth."[5]

As the rhetorical phrases of Aristides, who composed under Hadrian a declamatory exercise on the burning of the Eleusinian temple, are evidently too superficial, and a mere echo of the words of Isocrates, we can only quote of the Greeks, Diodorus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and particularly the Stoic Arrian. The latter asserts the Eleusinian mysteries to be profitable if approached after previous purification by sacrifice and prayer, and with a sentiment of the ancient dignity of those ceremonies; and therefore it may be conjectured that the ancients introduced them with the intention of bettering and perfecting life.[6] Arrian knew nothing of doctrine being imparted in them. Whilst Plutarch, who held Euhemerism in abhorrence, had

[1] Plut. *Consol. ad Uxor.*, *Opp.* viii. 411 (Reisk. 611).
[2] *De Facie in orbe lunæ*, ix. 715 sqq. (544?).
[3] *De Lib. educ.* vi. 24.
[4] *De Orac. def.* vii. 642 (485?); *de Isid.* vii. 424 (330, 331?).
[5] Diodor. iii. 62 (ii. 348, Bip.). [6] Epict. *Dys.* iii. 2, p. 440, Schweigh.

so low an opinion of the mysteries, it is striking, on the other hand, to find so favourable a judgment passed upon these institutes by a man like Diodorus, whose work is leavened throughout with Euhemerist views. He says of the Samothracian mysteries, "they are renowned because the gods appeared to the initiated, and assisted them in danger, and that men, by initiation, become more god-fearing and righteous, and thoroughly better than they were before"[1] Another remarkable expression of Diodorus will find place further on. The judgment of a contemporary of his, the Jew Philo, is different: "It happens frequently that not a single honest man is initiated, but highwaymen, pirates, and swarms of impure women, if they only give the hierophants money."[2] The decision of Dionysius is not less unfavourable to the mysteries, for he considered it an important advantage the Romans had over the Greeks, that they had not introduced any such rites. In his eyes, the mere existence of these mysteries, with their fables of the gods, "in which there was mighty little good," was a downright evil.[3]

Among the Romans we find Varro, Cicero, the Ciceronian Cotta, and the Stoic Annæus Cornutus in Nero's time, the authorities whose judgments upon the Greek mysteries afford information. Varro, a spirit that strove earnestly to investigate the unknown, and to clear up the obscure, discovered nothing in the Eleusinia but a mytho-allegorical representation of the sowing and cultivation of corn. There was much, he allowed, that was imparted in these mysteries, but all had relation to the discovery of agriculture.[4] Cotta, the Academician and pontiff, came to the same conclusion. If people, he thought, would restore their real signification to the acts and adventures of the gods, as narrated and exhibited in the Eleusinian and Samothracian mysteries, they would assuredly learn more of the nature of things than of that of the gods by the process.[5] He too had derived from these mysteries the fixed impression that they really dealt with natural phenomena; and that the Cabiri, the Cerealic,

[1] Diod. v. 49 (iii. 362, Bip.).
[2] Philo, *de Sacrificant.* p. 857 A.
[3] *Antiq. Rom.* ii. 19 (i. 273, Reisk.).
[4] *Ap. Aug. Civ. D.* vii. 20.
[5] Cic. *Nat. Deor.* i. 42.

and Chthonic deities were but powers of nature personified, —their histories and sorrows and joys, physical states allegorised.

Cicero himself, according as he spoke of the mysteries in the character of orator or philosopher, either brought out what was more appropriate for rhetorical ornament, or what seemed to him the kernel and whole impression remaining after the husk of symbol and myth had been removed. If, on one side, he adopted the expressions of Isocrates, or, as in his orations against Verres, lauded the secret rites of the two goddesses, by whom the sources of life and nourishment were opened, and from whom issued the precedents of laws and customs, refinement and the humanities; on the other, he is equally committed, in one of his philosophical works, to the doctrine of Euhemerism as being the core and fundamental principle of the mysteries. It resulted, he thought, from the Greek traditions, that even they who passed for gods of the first rank reached heaven from us here below. "Inquire further," he goes on, "to whom belong the sepulchres people point to in Greece—(those of Zeus in Crete, Asclepios in Arcadia,[1] and Dionysos at Delphi),—bethink yourself, as you are initiated, of what you have been taught in the mysteries; then at last you will be capable of taking in the full extent of this view;"[2] the view, he means, that to the eye and comprehension of the intelligent, the whole staff of gods was composed of nothing but men, whom the blindness and gratitude of the lower earth had exalted into gods.

The Stoic Cornutus holds with Cicero the orator: "The mysteries were instituted to record the invention of agriculture, and the transition to a civilised state associated with it, and as an exhibition of joy for these benefits."[3] On the other hand, his countryman Apuleius, the learned Platonist, a great partisan of, and investigator into, the mysteries, and who had himself been initiated in them all, while travelling, carefully preserved every sacred token and talisman[4] so received, and wrote his far-famed romance principally to recommend the mysteries. From them he

[1] *De Nat. Deor.* iii. 21, 22. [2] *Tuscul.* i. 13.
[3] Cornut. *de Nat. Deor.* c. xxviii. p. 169, Osann.
[4] Apul. *Apol. s. de Magiâ*, 494, *Opp.* ii. 517, Bosscha.

had learnt that one goddess reigned supreme over all the deities, and as mistress of the kingdom of nature, who was queen alike of souls severed from the body, and Ceres and Proserpine withal, and who was worshipped by various nations, and in the mysteries, under many different titles, as Isis, Cybele, Hecate, Juno, Venus, and Diana.[1]

The judgment of Christian apologists on the mysteries is decidedly unfavourable and conveyed in terms of bitter invective. It is obvious that nothing was exhibited or taught in these institutions that had any affinity whatever to Christian doctrine, or that could be interpreted as favouring it, otherwise they would not have failed to avail themselves of it. Rather, they considered the mysteries as mainstays of the prevailing paganism, and schools too of the most ruinous and degrading superstition. It has been observed,[2] that not one of these apologists actually asserts that he had been initiated. Tatian, however, while mentioning his journeys through different countries, and the investigations he had pursued of the manifold forms of heathen error, says once expressly that he had been admitted into the mysteries; and it would have been singular if, in so doing, he had entirely passed over the Eleusinia, the most celebrated and esteemed of all; for, when speaking of them, he asserts that the Athenians, who had converted the rape of Coré and the sorrows of Demeter for her daughter into a mystery, still continued to find people who allowed themselves to be deceived by them.[3]

There was at Athens then a community of Christians, among whom must have been many of the initiated. From Athens originally came Clement's master, Athenagoras, to whom we are indebted for the most exact account of the mysteries. From thence the Christian apologists Quadratus and Aristides wrote. No Christian author who was in earnest about it could have experienced any difficulty in informing himself in detail of the contents of the Eleusinia, either by the writings or the oral testimony of his fellows in faith. Above all, there were men amongst them who, only after sifting the pagan religion and philosophy for years without arriving at certainty or repose of soul, had entered

[1] Apul. *Metamorph.* xi. 241, *Opp.* i. 763. [2] Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* 197.
[3] Tatian, *Or. ad Græc.* c. ix. 29, p. 40 (112, ed. Otto).

into communion with the Church of Christ. These, in the course of their examination, had undoubtedly tested that institute, which was usually esteemed the flower of the Hellenic religion. Gregory of Nazianzus lived at Athens a long time for the sake of study, in fact, at the very period when Julian, who was subsequently emperor, was on the most intimate footing with the hierophants, and he had probably had himself initiated. It would have been strange if, in a time of the intensest struggle between Christendom and heathendom, and active interchange of polemical writings, a young and ardent pursuer of knowledge like Gregory had never once taken the trouble to inquire of his Athenian co-religionists, who had embraced the faith only in their maturity, what it was that really took place in the Eleusinia. Now, as he mentions the scandalous things which the Demeter of the mysteries did and submitted to, and then adds, "I take shame to myself for drawing the mystery of darkness into the light; Eleusis knows it, and the Epoptæ,[1] who conceal these things, which indeed deserve concealment"; surely the presumption is, he knew what he was saying. We learn from a heathen's own mouth, how often it happened that the purport of the Greek mysteries was exposed by the initiated who had become converts to Christianity in the very assemblies of the Christians. It was quite an ordinary thing, in the days of Libanius, for Christian bishops to allow women to come forward publicly in their congregations to disclose and deride the secrets of the demons, of Ino, of the youth (Zagreus), of the Cabiri, and of Demeter.[2]

Clement of Alexandria, who took so favourable a view of the Greek philosophy that, in spite of the then evidence of its hostile attitude towards Christianity, he declared it to be a gift of God to the Greeks, and an institute for their education,—this same Clement pronounced a sentence of the severest condemnation on the mysteries, of which, to all appearance, he had an accurate knowledge. These, as he represents them, had sown far and wide the seeds of wickedness and corruption in the life of man. They were institutes full of deceit and imposture, in which a mangled boy

[1] Gregor. Naz. *Or.* xxxix. p. 679 (ed. Paris, 779).
[2] Liban. *pro Aristoph.*, *Opp.* i. 448, Reisk.

(Zagreus), a wailing woman (Demeter), and members which modesty refuses to name, were adored.[1] Tertullian, Arnobius, Eusebius, and Firmicus make precisely the same statement.

Widely, then, as these judgments of Greek, Roman, and Christian diverge, their contradiction is but apparent. Put all the statements together, keeping in mind the while the point of view occupied by each witness, and then the admiration and disgust, the praise and the blame, excited by the mysteries, the silence of one party, and the effusion of the other, will be perfectly intelligible.

ORPHEUS AND HIS FOLLOWERS

A Thracian hero, whom the Greeks used to contemplate under the name of Orpheus, as the representative of the oldest religious poetry belonging to the mythical period, is also pointed out as the originator and first founder of mysteries in general, and of the mythic rite of Dionysos in particular. Precisely where the mystery system developed in its greatest luxuriance—in Athens, for instance—he occupies the position of a founder. The poets and orators of that place are unanimous in asserting that it was he who taught "the holy rites," and who revealed "unspeakable mysteries"; and therefore it was fitting that the daughter of Demeter should honour those who were intimately bound to Orpheus.[2] This idea was attached to his name in the rest of Greece as well, as is shown by the testimony of Ephorus,[3] by the wooden image of the hero preserved in the temple of the Eleusinian Demeter on Taÿgetus, and the figure of Telete, or the mystery rite personified, which was placed at the side of his statue on Helicon.[4]

The key, too, to the mythical stories generally circulated in Greece about Orpheus, his descent into Hades, and his tragical death at the hands of the Mænads, is to be found

[1] Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* pp. 13, 14, Potter.

[2] Demosth. *Aristog.* p. 772; Aristoph. *Ran.* 1032; Eurip. *Rhes.* 943; Plat. *Protag.* 316 D.

[3] *Ap. Diodor.* v. 64.

[4] Pausan. iii. 20. 5.

in his relation to the mysteries and the Dionysiac worship. According to the old worn-out notions current in Homer, deceased people led a gloomy, sorrowful, shadow life in Hades. The good and bad, the pious and the wicked, there dwelt together confusedly, without memory, until they tasted blood. Only special enemies of the gods there endured punishment; and sundry favourites and sons of the gods were vouchsafed a blissful immortality in Elysium, an island of the western ocean.[1] The state of the nether world was represented quite in a different way in the mysteries. Hope, as well as fear, was there profoundly stirred; and whence was this knowledge derived, so directly opposed to the high authority of Homer? No demand could be made of right upon the faith of people, unless the founder had seen what was going on below with his own eyes, and had brought the account of it back on his return to the living. Thus originated the myth of the descent of Orpheus into the lower regions; his desire to see his wife, and the hope of bringing her back with him, was made to serve as the occasion.

The legend of the death of Orpheus by the hands of the Mænads involves the record of an historical event—the contest which arose from the antagonism of two opposite rites belonging to the same deity. The worship of the wine-god, originating in Asia, had reached Thrace through Phrygian tribes settled on either side of the sea; for in the earliest times the Phrygians formed the main stock of the population of Thrace and Macedonia. This worship was a rite of tumultuous revelry, which hurried its adherents into wild, unbridled licentiousness, and ebriety destructive to reason. The god himself, according to the myth, having been long in a state of frenzy, there was a propriety in his throwing his worshippers into the same state; and the fury, which was the necessary consequence of excessive indulgence in wine, when it passed into an abiding madness, was considered as a revenge inflicted by the god, especially in the case of women, on which sex this worship must have had a particularly pernicious influence; and that they were distinguished in their devotion to the rite is proved by the traditions regarding the female companies of Dionysos, the

[1] *Odyss.* xi. 475, 480, 568 sqq., 601.

Bacchants and Mænads. The daughters of Minyas, of Prœtus and Eleutherus, Leucippe, and Antiope, all owed their madness to the god; and men must often have been indignant at a rite which taught their wives and daughters to assume habitual drunkenness to be a state acceptable to the god, and extravagant contortions of the body and shameless nudity as an inspiration from him. Hence such traditions as the one in Argos, wherein the sun worship which had come from Asia and was embodied in the hero Perseus, resisted to blood the intrusion of the worship of Dionysos; and the graves of the female Bacchants who were slain in the conflict were still exhibited in the days of Pausanias.[1] The Pentheus saga points to a similar resistance and as sanguinary a quarrel taking place in Bœotia on the introduction of the new cultus.

If, then, Orpheus was put to death by the Thracian women in the service of Bacchus, Mænads or Bassaridæ, according to the tradition, it is beyond question a matter of a struggle between two forms of cultus; the latter of the two, the Orphic and mystical, endeavouring to thrust aside or to tone down the earlier wild and dissolute female rite. Almost all the accounts assign as the cause of his death the institution, or introduction by him into Thrace, of the mysteries; which means, it was the anger of the god Dionysos, who would not be robbed of the Mænad cultus, hitherto his own, that brought destruction upon him; or that he had been celebrating the orgies of Dionysos in a building appointed for the purpose, in company with the Thracian men, whereupon the women excluded by him, possessing themselves of the men's arms, which had been left at the entrance door, hacked him in pieces and threw his remains into the sea.[2] There was then a mystical rite of Dionysos that was celebrated by the men, which was opposed to the unbridled riot and license of that of the women. The laceration of Orpheus appears to be a later mythical embellishment, reminding one of Pentheus, and charging the manner of the god's death on the priests. Another tradition[3] makes him out to have been slain by Zeus, in displeasure for his having revealed

[1] Pausan. ii. 20. 3, 22. 1 [2] Conon, xlv.
[3] Pausan. ix. 30. 3; Diog. Laert. procem. v.

holy things in the mysteries, which ought to have been kept secret.[1]

The country of the Cicones has been assigned as the theatre of the operations of Orpheus in founding the mysteries, and also of his death. It is situated on the southern coast of Thrace, and its most important town was Maronea, which, later on, received colonists from Chios as its inhabitants.[2] In order to gain a point for history to rest on, the Ciconian Orpheus was made in the sequel into two distinct personages; one of whom, the eldest, was son of Æagros; the other, the younger by about eleven generations, was the founder of the mysteries.[3] The mysteries in existence amongst the Cicones, and therefore of course in Maronea, Diodorus ranks in the same category with the Samothracian and Eleusinian, but in such a way as to admit all to have resembled those solemnised in Crete, and to have borne a strong resemblance to one another in essentials.[4] In reality a

[1] The statement of John of Salisbury, evidently drawn from an old and now apparently lost source (Polycrat. i. 6), that the mothers of the Ciconian husbands, abetted by their daughters-in-law, murdered Orpheus because he had made the husbands effeminate by his rites, means no more than that the milder Orphic worship of Dionysos had attempted to put down the earlier rough and wild worship of the Thracians. If Phanocles (*ap. Stob. serm.* lxiv.) and Ovid (*Met.* x. 83) attribute the vengeance taken by the women of Thrace on Orpheus to the introduction of pæderastia by him, this seems to me to confirm the Cretan origin of the Orphic mysteries; for the love of boys was a crime very early naturalised, nay organised, so to say, in Crete, the introduction of which Aristotle (*Pol.* ii. 10) ascribes to Minos; and the propagation of which in Hellas Timæus (*ap. Athen.* xiii. 79, p. 602) attributes to the Cretans generally. This immorality may have made its way there from Thrace, together with the Orphico-Dionysic worship. Because of the contradiction of Bode (*Gesch. der Hellen. Dichtkunst*, i. 110) and others, I must not leave unmentioned that they are quite the earlier authorities who fix the theatre of the operations or the death of Orpheus in the land of the Cicones, and therefore in the neighbourhood of Maronea. See Diodor. (v. 77), Aristot. (*Epitaph.* 46), the *Orphean Argonautica* (ver. 78), besides Eustath. *ad Homer.* 596, 847; Mela, ii. 2, 8; *Solin.* 10; Marcian. *Capella*, vi. p. 557. Strabo, however (p. 330), makes Pimplea in Thessaly his dwelling-place; and a proverb in Pausanias locates his grave near the very early destroyed Libethra in Pieria, on Mount Olympus, and this has been often repeated. That an old and very renowned hero like Orpheus should have sagas about him in various spots of ancient Thrace is natural; but the establishment of the Orphic mysteries is, for Thrace, unmistakably bound up with the Ciconian land and people.

[2] Herodot. vii. 109; *Hymn.* 675. [3] Eustath. *ad Iliad*, 359. 15.

[4] Lobeck finds fault with him for this, as there were no more Cicones in existence in his time. Certainly the inhabitants of the country were no longer so called, yet it was quite natural that Diodorus should have used the name in

very old colony, starting from Crete, and carrying with it the culture of the grape and the worship of Dionysos, sat itself down in Thrace, and in fact just at Maronea; of which place, and of the cultivation of the vine in the neighbourhood, Maron was reckoned the founder. Homer mentions him as a priest of Apollo, and as having excellent wine,[1] and the ancients represent him as a son of the Cretan Ariadne and of Dionysos, or of the Cretan Œnopion, the man of wine, or of the Cretan Evanthe, banished by Rhadamanthus, and therefore a descendant of Ænopion, as well as of Dionysos himself; and he then symbolised in his own person the introduction of the culture of the grape, and the rite of Dionysos connected with it, from Crete into the country of the Cicones.[2]

Æschylus has given another turn to the death of Orpheus,—that Dionysos in his wrath sent the Bassaridæ against the seer, and had him torn in pieces by them, because Orpheus had not worshipped him as the greatest of the gods, but Helios, whom he also denominates Apollo.[3] There is no contradiction here of the generally received notion of Orpheus as a minister of Dionysos; but a corroboration of the fact that the spread of a new mystical rite was connected with the name of Orpheus. As a consequence of the blending that had taken place in Crete of the Egyptian Osiris with the Thraco-Grecian wine-god, the Orphic Dionysos had certainly become a solar deity, and therefore Helios, and so he was termed in the Orphic writings.[4] This notion is borne out by some few of the local rites, as also by the expressions of

order to direct attention to the antiquity of the mysteries there, they in fact having passed from the Cicones to the later inhabitants.

[1] *Odyss.* ix. 197.

[2] Schol. *Apollon.* iii. 997; Pausan. vii. 4. 6; Diodor. v. 79,—where, instead of "Euambes," according to Wesseling's generally received emendation, we must read "Evanthes." Diodorus (i. 18, 20), following one of the old Creto-Egyptian sagas, which ascribes the migrations of Dionysos to Osiris, converts Maron into an attendant of the latter, who leaves him behind in Thrace, as an experienced cultivator of the grape, to found Maronea, just as he set Triptolemus over Attica and its agriculture. There is nothing more expressed in this, than that the Cretan worship of Dionysos, after being modified by the engrafting on it of certain Egyptian features taken from Osiris, was imported into this part of Greece.

[3] Eratosth. *Catast.* xxiv.

[4] *Vide* the passages in Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* i. 460, 498.

poets and philosophers. The Eleans honoured Dionysos, who was generally the god they treated with the highest reverence, as the sun;[1] while at Rhodes, where in earlier times the worship of Helios and Apollo had been quite distinct, at a later period Apollo, Helios, and Dionysos passed for one and the same deity.[2] A poem bearing the name of Eumolpus, and therefore belonging to the mystery set, styled him the "star-bright god, with ray-crowned face of fire."[3]

The Apollo, however, who was either nearly akin to Dionysos, and thereby to Helios, or really identical with him, was not the ordinary Achæo-Doric son of Leto, but the Cretan one, whose worship was transplanted from thence to the ancient Cretan colony of Crissa in Phocis, and afterwards to the neighbourhood of Delphi. Homer and Hesiod were not acquainted with him. This Apollo was a son of Corybas, and, through this father of his, the son of Cybele and the Arcad-Samothracic-Cretan Jasion,[4] in closest relations with the cultus of the Asiatic great-mother of the gods, as he himself again was converted into the father of the Corybantes (the Curetes of Crete), sometimes conceived to be demon creatures, at other times only mortals and priests of Cybele. He was accordingly an original production in Crete of the cultus of Rhea, or Cybele, introduced thither from Phrygia. The Phrygian Attes-Sabazius was not radically distinct from him, and hence this particular Apollo was near of kin to the Dionysos of Crete, who, on his side, was formed by blending Osiris with the Phrygian Attes or Corybas. Both deities, by virtue of their descent and origin, had a solar character, which appears to have been originally quite as foreign to that of the Homeric and Achæo-Doric Apollo, on the one side, as to that of the Greek god of the grape, Dionysos, on the other. Both were coupled together as having relation to the sun, Apollo as being the sun above, or god of light to the upper hemisphere, Dionysos the sun of the world below, or god of the lower hemisphere.[5] One can see, then, how the Maron we have alluded to was at the same time a priest of this

[1] *Etymol. Magn. s.v.* Διόνυσος. [2] Dio Chrys. *Or.* xxxi. p. 365, Emper.
[3] Diodor. i. 11. [4] *Ibid.* v. 49. [5] Macrob. *Sat.* i. 18.

Apollo and of Dionysos, and how easy it was for both to be fused into one deity of the sun, Helios.

Thus is cleared up the close connection between the worship of Apollo and Dionysos at Delphi, which had received its Apollo worship from Crete. There the sepulchre of Dionysos was close to the tripod of the Pythian Apollo; there the entire holy place was consecrated to the two deities, and sacrifice was offered to both. Every year the Thyades coming out of Attica, and uniting with the women of Delphi, solemnised the orgies of the two gods in concert on the top of Parnassus.[1] At Phlya in Attica also people worshipped an Apollo, "the gift of Dionysos." Hence both gods interchanged their own peculiar attributes. The great resemblance between the Dionysic oracle of the Thracians and that of the Apollo of Delphi was striking even to Herodotus in his time.

The Orpheus of Æschylus would thus be a stranger to the worship of the frantic wine-god Dionysos. He served instead Helios, whose cultus in the mysteries that had originated in Crete was equivalent to that of Apollo and Dionysos together as solar deities; the one as the higher star, or that of the day, the other the lower one of the night, or lower world; and in fact Macrobius has expressly told us that the signification of the two was carefully observed in the mysteries. Hence, by degrees, the double and correlative idea, that Apollo was Helios, and that he was identical with Dionysos, spread abroad from the mysteries. Thus Euripides had already given Apollo the name of Bacchus, and the theological Aristotle had explained Apollo and Dionysos to be one and the same deity.[2]

Orpheus therefore, or the school of priests which seems to be personified in his name, imported the new Dionysic cultus from Crete into Thrace. He had been, it is said, in Crete a disciple of the Idæan Dactyli, who were either the body of priests consecrated to the service of the great mother of the gods, whose home was the Phrygian Ida, or else the portion of the old Cretan inhabitants who in their migration from Phrygia had

[1] Paus. x. 4. 2, 32. 5.

[2] In Macrob. *Sat.* i. 18.

brought that worship into the island; for the name of Dactyli had a considerably extensive ramification.[1] According to another account, Orpheus had been in Egypt also, and had provided himself with the religious knowledge that could be there acquired.[2] What is matter of fact in this tradition is this, that the peculiar religious doctrine which the Orphic school of priests transplanted in the form of mystery from Crete into Thrace, and thence into Hellas, received a shape from the combination of the doctrine of the Egyptian Osiris with the Phrygian worship of the island.

The cultus of the great nature-goddess, the Phrygian Cybele, was not distinguishable in essentials from that of the Cretan Rhea; it spread over the whole of Asia Anterior, and was coupled with the worship of a male deity, who, under the names of Corybas, Attes, or Sabazius, appears as minister and favourite, or else as son of the goddess. When inserted into Greek mythology, this god became identified with Zeus as son of Cronos sometimes; at others, and most frequently, he was changed into Dionysos, or at least his son;[3] but originally he was the mountain-god of the Phrygians, was honoured with special devotion in Thrace as the sun-god, and, as lord of natural moisture, was called Hyes. He was also the generative fruit-maturing power of nature, and as symbol of its annual decay, the self-enervating god, or the god driven to self-enervation by the great goddess of earth and nature. He too had orgies in his honour, which, being quite distinct from those of the Thraco-Grecian wine-god, had nothing to do with the Mænad rite.

In Crete this god passed for a son of Zeus and Persephone, the Dionysos Zagreus. In essentials he did not differ from the Syrian and Cyprian Adonis, who was likewise vegetative nature, personified, and at the same time the star to which all increase and growth is owing, namely, the sun. Now Adonis on one side was held by many to be identical with Dionysos, and this identity, according to Plutarch's observation,[4] was confirmed by the correspond-

[1] Ephor. *ap. Diodor.* v. 64. [2] Diodor. iv. 25.
[3] *Orph. Hymn.* 49; Hesych. *s.v.* "Sabazios."
[4] *Sympos.* iv. 5 (vol. viii. 667, ed. Reiske).

ence in their religious rites; on the other, so closely was he connected with the Egyptian Osiris, that he was even honoured under that title at Amathus in Cyprus with a cultus brought from Egypt; that in Byblus, the head-quarters of Adonis-worship, people asserted that the sepulchre of Osiris had been rediscovered there, and that the Alexandrines, at a later period, taught a mystic union of the two deities, worshipping in consequence Adonis and Osiris together under one idol.[1]

Now Attys, or Sabazius, in Asia Anterior, was by no means the god of wine, just as little as Osiris was so in Egypt, where a god of the grape and of drunkenness was not known at all; but in Crete these deities blended together with Dionysos, who thereby became quite a different being from the old Thracian god, and the god of the fields and flocks who was worshipped in Hellas, at the Ascolia and Anthesteria. The tradition that Dionysos had gone in a state of madness to Rhea, or Cybele, in Asia Anterior, that she had purified and healed and initiated him in her orgies, is in this regard as significant as it is instructive. What happened to the rite was transferred to the god, as was often the case; and the fact, stripped of its mythic veil, amounts to this,—that the cultus of the Thraco-Bœotian wine-god had been metamorphosed in essentials by the Phrygian one of Cybele and of Attys; for the orgies of the latter were, as has been observed, very different from the Bacchic: violent, passionate excitement, and the giving way to physical emotions, powerfully inflamed and artificially increased, occurred here and there. But the violence against one's own person, usual in the Phrygian cultus, mutilation and enervation of self, found no place in the old Bacchic orgies; women were the principal agents, who, as Mænads under the influence of wine, surrendered themselves to the wildest debaucheries. Dionysos now became a son of Rhea, in whose cultus "the Bacchus cries blend with the swelling tones of Phrygian flutes," and he the while, "high above on Ida, with his mother (Rhea Cybele), rejoices in the fanfar of the trumpets." [2]

So strong, however, is the resemblance that the Orphic Dionysos bears to the Egyptian Osiris, that he must be con-

[1] Suidas, *s.v.* "Heraiscus." [2] Eurip. *ap. Strabo*, p. 470 (684–5, Oxf.).

sidered as the facsimile of the other. In his Egyptian significations, as the generative and fructifying principle of nature generally, Osiris was also sun-god, just like Adonis; in particular as god of the departed, as ruler and judge of the realm of the dead, the sun of the lower world. He was treacherously murdered by his enemy and brother, the Typhon-Set, and his body hewn in pieces. His death and sufferings were solemnly represented in mystic show in Egypt, and, as it appears, all the mysteries celebrated at different places in the Nile-country were more or less indebted to him and his fate for their leading features.[1] Osiris, again, was the bull Apis, into whose body his soul migrated, and so came to be honoured as the bull, and to be represented with a bull's head. Horus, in fine, was nothing but an Osiris made young again into a fighting but victorious champion. The Osiris tradition was of such antiquity there, and, as is proved from inscriptions, so widely spread,[2] that an importation of it from Hellas is not to be thought of. On the contrary, the myth of the Orphic Dionysos, or Zagreus, must be held to be a Hellenic copy of the Egyptian. Nevertheless, in the case of Isis an importation of the kind did take place later on, and her Egyptian tradition was trimmed up with some few traits borrowed from the Greek Demeter, in the time of Alexander. Hence, doubtless, it came to pass that features quite un-Egyptian, such as the invention of the cultivation of the grape, were imputed to Osiris himself in a later account.[3]

Originally, therefore, Dionysos Zagreus belonged to the Cretan religious creed. Euripides makes a choir of Cretan priests say they were devotees of the Idæan Zeus, and Zagreus of the night. An author of the fourth century has communicated the tradition of him found in the Euhemeristic dress of the older Cretan fabulists, from whom Diodorus[4] had already extracted a very similar one. Dionysos is a son of the Cretan king Zeus, begotten in adultery. The father, when setting out on a journey, had intrusted his throne and sceptre to the youth. But Hera, his stepmother, enticed the child away with a mirror and

[1] Lepsius, "Über den Ægypt. Götterkreis," in the *Berlin Akad. Abhandlg.* 1851, p. 192.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] In Porphyry, *de Abst.* iv. 19 (p. 365, Rhoer.).
[4] Diodor. i. 17–20.

playthings, till he was out of reach of the protection of the palace, whereupon her servants, the Titans, put him to death, hewed him in pieces, boiled his limbs, and consumed them. The heart alone was saved by his sister Athene, and restored to her father on his return, who killed the Titans, and enclosed the heart in a plaster image resembling the child. The Cretans since then celebrated the trieteric festivals, in which all that Zagreus had done and suffered was imitated; a living bull was torn by the teeth, and the chest in which the sister hid the heart was carried about[1] with orgiastic rites. Diodorus also informs us that, according to the traditions of the Cretans, the divine child was born in their island; and that Zeus had begotten him of his own daughter Persephone, whom he had overpowered under the form of a serpent.[2]

There, then, the fate of Osiris was that of Zagreus. What Typhon and his seventy-two conspirators perpetrate on the Egyptian, that the earth-born Titans execute on the other; and as the Ethiopic queen is the instigatrix of the murder in the one case, so is Hera in the other. Both by their death become gods of the lower world, so that Hesychius explains the name Zagreus as simply identical with Dionysos Chthonios.[3] As the bull Apis was honoured as Osiris, who through that animal had received an abiding habitation among mortals, so among the Greeks Dionysos was frequently figured as a bull, or at least with a bull's horns, directly addressed as the bull, and as such invoked.[4] Mnaseas explained Epaphos, the Greek expression for Apis, as a synonym of Dionysos, as well as of Osiris and Serapis;[5] and if Diodorus asserts this Dionysos, the son of Zeus and Persephone, or Demeter, to be the same who first taught how to yoke the plough with oxen,[6] this must be taken as an Euhemeristic interpretation of his being represented with bull's horns. With the like genuine Euhemerism, Diodorus only admits Dionysos to have been deified on account of the greatness of that benefit to mankind. The mangled remains of the god were possibly deposited at Delphi, the close connection of which place with Crete has been already

[1] Firmic. Mat. *de Error. prof. rel.* c. vi. p. 68, Oehler.
[2] Diodor. v. 75. [3] *Lex.* i. 1573, Albert. [4] Athen. ii. 7, p. 476.
[5] *Fragm. Hist. Gr.* ed. Didot, iii. 155. 37. [6] Diod. iii. 61.

remarked upon. Philochorus, writing about the year 306 B.C., speaks of the sepulchre of Dionysos as to be found there in the temple of Apollo, under the tripod of that god: here the five Hosioi (hallowed ministers) offered him a secret sacrifice, and the Thyades "waked" the dead Dionysos Liknites, of whom the euphemistic expression "he sleeps" was used. This surname he took from the fan, which has the same meaning in his case as in that of Osiris, where Isis collected the scattered members of her husband in a fan.[1] In Crete itself, the mysteries relating to the fate of Zagreus were solemnised in Phrygian orgic fashion—a living bull was torn in pieces by the teeth. In the carrying about of the chest, and in the noisy wailing for the god's death, the partakers in the orgies behaved like frantic people,[2] as the Asiatics did in the Attis and Adonis solemnity.

Attempts have been made to refer this legend of the laceration of Dionysos to a later date, principally because of the assertion of Pausanias, that the Orphic poet Onomacritus (about 520–485 B.C.) was the first to ascribe the origination of the suffering inflicted on Zagreus to the Titans. But if Pausanias did not know any older poet who had named the Titans as the actors, surely this would only prove at the most, that this part of the tradition before Onomacritus had not yet made its way from the mysteries into public circulation and into poetry: the tradition itself is certainly much older; and Terpander had already made mention of a Dionysos who was son of Zeus and Persephone.[3] The tomb at Delphi, and the general acceptance by the Greeks, and by Herodotus himself, of the fact of Dionysos being the Egyptian Osiris, go to corroborate the higher antiquity of the Zagreus fable; for the Grecian wine-god, it is clear, could not have been assumed to be identical with Osiris; inasmuch as the Egyptians would have been just the last to think that it reflected much honour on their highest and best god to have attributed to him the invention of wine, a beverage they esteemed evil and impure.[4] It was, then, the mystery doctrine of the dismemberment of Dionysos, and the correlative idea of him, as god of the

[1] Serv. *ad Georg.* i. 166.
[2] Firmic. *l.c.* p. 69.
[3] Höck's *Kreta*, iii. 184.
[4] Jablonsky, *Pantheon Ægypt.* i. 130.

under world, which authorised this identification. Herodotus, who only lived some few decennia later than Onomacritus, says[1] the Egyptians hold Dionysos with Demeter (he meant Isis) to be gods of the nether world. Had he not in that instance had the Zagreus shape, which Dionysos assumes in the mysteries, in his eye, he would have more probably interpreted Osiris, who is ordinarily represented with the ithyphallus amongst the Egyptians, to be the Greek Hermes. Æschylus too styles this underworld god Zagreus;[2] and an earlier writer than they or Onomacritus, Pherecydes (about 544 B.C.), must have been already acquainted with the myth; for his Ophioneus, the serpent-god, who was issue of the loves of Zeus and Chthonia (Persephone), and acted as leader in a battle of the gods, but was worsted,[3] is in every circumstance a close approximation to the Zagreus born of Persephone from her intercourse with Zeus in form of a serpent. Lastly, it was also perfectly well known at Delphi that the Liknites, there buried and honoured, was no other than Osiris; for Plutarch tells Clea, "she, as high priestess of the Delphic Thyades, and as having been already initiated by her father and mother in the worship of Osiris (meaning that her father as Hosios, and her mother as Thyad, had been in the service of Dionysos Liknites), could not but have known this right well."[4]

The Cretans saw an evidence of the high antiquity of their mystery rite in the fact that whatever was observed and communicated as secret worship in the mystery discipline amongst the Cicones (or their successors) in Thrace, at Samothrace, and in the Eleusinia, the same was with them openly exhibited, and every one was admitted thereto, without further condition.[5] This public celebration of the mysteries consisted in the already mentioned representation of the Zagreus myth; and it will be shown at greater length below how far the same event entered into the secret rite at Samothrace and the Eleusinia at Athens. So, in the territory of the old Cicones at Maronea, there existed a mystery institute akin to the Cretan, and,

[1] Herodot. ii. 123.
[2] *Etymol. Gud.* p. 227; Max. Tyr. x. 4.
[3] Max. Tyr. x. 4.
[4] Plut. *de Isid.* xxxv. p. 59, Parthey.
[5] Diod. v. 77.

according to the legend, brought thither by Orpheus from Crete; not indeed mentioned elsewhere, but the existence and transplantation of which receives a corroborative testimony from the legend in question, according to which the Dionysic cultus was brought, along with the use of the vine, from Crete to Maronea (or Ismaros).

Accordingly the Greek mystery system represents itself as an institute having its first rise in Crete, whence it was transferred at the same time to Thrace and to Hellas (Delphi), and again extended its influence back upon the neighbouring islands, Lemnos and Samothrace, as well as to Athens. This transplantation could not, of course, have been the work of one man, since nothing historically tenable can be asserted about the mythical personality of Orpheus; it was a priest class, or a school of priests, the Orphic, which was the receptacle of the mystery rite; and again, this institute was the stay and prop on which the Orphic succession proceeded, and the bond which embraced the individual members and kept them together.

Herodotus understood the terms Orphici and Pythagorici as denominations of the same school or class. The latter, who, since the dispersion of their association in Magna Græcia (about 500 B.C.), began to spread in Hellas, appropriated the Orphic or Bacchic traditions and religious views; and it appears that much that had hitherto been transmitted through the mysteries, and the circle of priests connected with them, now first, in the main from the time of Æschylus, passed into the literature of the land, and became the common property of the higher educated class. Assuredly the Pythagoreans were not the originators of the Orphi-Bacchic creed:[1] this they found already in existence and possessed themselves of, being determined thereto, principally by the doctrine of immortality, so important to them, for which they required a religious warranty and foundation, which the popular and epic creeds did not supply, and which they only could find in the Orphi-Dionysic religion. For if even the elder Orphici had not already themselves received

[1] As Brandis (*Gesch. d. Griech. Philos.* i. 55 sqq.) and Lobeck (*Aglaoph.* i. *passim*) agree in thinking.

the doctrine of the migration of souls from Egypt, and embodied it in their traditions, still there was room left in them for that purpose, as this doctrine could easily have been included in the Zagreus myth.

The oldest Orphic priest of whom history makes mention was the Cretan Epimenides, the minister of atonement, who was called to Athens, about the year 612 B.C., to release state and people from the guilt of Cylon's bloodshed, and to free them from its consequence, the plague. His Orphic style of life, the knowledge of mysteries attributed to him, together with the testimony that he himself was a Cures, and had poetised the genesis of the Curetes and Corybantes, all contribute to prove that he came out of the Egypto-Phrygian and Cretan mystery college already in existence on his own island. His invitation points at the same time to the old intercourse between Attica with Crete, of which, in a religious point of view, the mysteries practised in both places were doubtless the medium. Whether or not Pythagoras was himself initiated in the Orphic mysterics, at Libethra, by the priest Aglaophamus, must remain undecided, as the account is a very late one. The oldest Pythagorean known to have been of the Orphic school was Cercops. After him came Brontinus, and particularly the above-mentioned Onomacritus, who composed oracles at Athens for political purposes, and is said to have been a prolific parent of Orphic doctrinal poems and hymns. The "mysteries,"[1] containing the legend of Zagreus, and composed or collected and arranged by him, was the most famous poem of the kind.

With the Orphic theology a rule of life, also called Orphic, was connected; and its precepts of prohibition and abstinence were also communicated in the mysteries. Hence the statement of Diogenes: "Pythagoras (*i.e.* the Pythagorean college) has enjoined to avoid all those things which the priests are accustomed to forbid in the functions of the mysteries in the temples." As such forbidden things he enumerates specially the contact of corpses, and of women during their delivery, whereby man would become polluted and impure; next, the use of flesh that has been

[1] Pausan. viii. 37, where the word used is ὄργια (Tr.).

gnawed by beasts, or that of dead animals, certain fishes, eggs, and beans."[1] All these prohibitions involved a religious principle that was imparted in "holy legends." When, further, it is there asserted that the doctrine, "People must honour the gods by purity," is Pythagorean,—such purity being something entirely external, to be effected by ablutions and aspersions,—this too was plainly a doctrine, not invented by Pythagoras, but borrowed from the mystery institutes themselves; and the rule of life was the same which the choir of Cretan priests, initiated in the mysteries there, describes in Euripides: "I lead a purer life since I became initiate of Idæan Zeus and of the nightly Zagreus, since I consummated the repast of raw meat" (the tearing of the Dionysic bull, and the tasting of his flesh), "and bore the torches of Cybele, mother of mountains; since my induction as a priest of the Curetes, clothed in sheeny vestment, I flee the birth of mortal, and touch not the coffin, and renounce all tasting of that which has life."[2] Not to kill living creatures, and to live only on non-animal food, was a precept founded on the doctrine of migration of souls; and many of the Orphic body never took flesh-meat more after having tasted of the flesh of the bull of the mysteries. Hence the same tragic poet makes Theseus say scornfully to his son, who is represented as being of the Orphic persuasion, "Do thou, then, play the cheat with thy starving meal of lifeless food, and be the bacchant, with Orpheus for thy king."[3] Lastly, to all appearance, the prohibition of woollen garments, or at least against entering a temple in a dress of the kind, or allowing oneself to be buried in woollen, considered by Herodotus to be Egyptian, and at the same time Orphi-Bacchic or Pythagorean, was introduced into Hellas from Egypt by way of Crete, with some other peculiarities of the Osiris worship. In the same way, the Pythagorean prohibition of beans was an Orphic one from Egypt (where the priests dared not even look at that vegetable,

[1] Diog. Laert. viii. 33. [2] *Ap. Porphyr. de Abst.* iv. 19, p. 365, Rhoer.

[3] δι' ἀψύχου βορᾶς Σίτοις καπήλευ', κ.τ.λ. Eurip. *Hippol.* 952 (Oxf.): see Lidd. and Scott, *Lex. s.v.* καπηλεύω; or as in the German, "Sadden thy meal with lifeless food," etc.

so impure was it held),[1] and was also inculcated in the mysteries. There was an Orphic verse to this effect: "A man must shun the eating of a bean, as much as if it were his own father's head."[2]

There is no evidence to the effect that at any one time there existed a regularly formed association of Orphici in Greece. Those who bore that title were priests or ministers of the secret worship celebrated in a number of places; or they were followers of the Pythagorean school, that class of the Pythagoreans which, in the flourishing times of the sect, turned its thoughts more especially towards religious matters, and was distinct from the other two classes of "politici" and "speculativi."[3]

The Zagreus myth, forming the pith and nucleus of the Orphic doctrine, has been already mentioned in its Cretan Euhemeristic dress; but as it is of decided importance in the understanding of the mysteries, it must be once again the subject of our consideration here. Dionysos Zagreus, the son of Zeus and Persephone, the darling child of the father, and loaded with distinctions by him, sat enthroned by his side, and already hurled the lightning, while Apollo and the Curetes kept watch over him to shield him from Hera's malice. Nevertheless Hera succeeded in the destruction of the child by means of the Titans, whom she instigated to the deed. Creeping softly into the apartment, their dark faces whitened with clay, they lured the child with some gaudy playthings, and, falling upon him suddenly, overpowered him. It was in vain he resisted, and tried to escape their murderous hands by metamorphosing himself in various ways. They tore him to pieces, boiled his members in a caldron, and devoured him. Thereupon Zeus swallowed the heart of his son, that had been saved by Athene, from which he conceived seed for the procreation of the second, or Theban, Dionysos. At the bidding of Zeus, Apollo collected all that remained of the body of Zagreus, and interred it; but Rhea, or Demeter (who was his mother, according to

[1] Herod. ii. 37.

[2] Heraclid. *ap. Lydum de Mens.* p. 76; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 435.

[3] According to the division into σεβαστικοί, πολιτικοί, and μαθηματικοί. *Vita Pythag. ap. Photium Biblioth.* 249, p. 438, ed. Bekker.

another legend [1]), again united the remains, and imparted life to them, and thus, according to one of the myths, a rejuvenescent Dionysos then arose. Out of the ashes of the Titans, whom Zeus destroyed by lightning, men were formed, who from thence inherited the good and the bad, the Dionysic and Titanic nature.[2]

The Orphici, at least the later ones, interpret the mangling of the little god, and his previous metamorphoses into all elements, in a pantheistic sense. The deity, says Plutarch, is in truth immutable and everlasting by nature; but has complacency in its variations of itself, and becomes what man calls universe, by assuming different forms, conditions, and powers, and developing variety. As, further, according to the Orphic myth, man was formed of the substance of Dionysos mixed with Titanic matter, that would seem to explain the ethical dualism in man, and the admixture of good and bad in him; man would then feel himself, as it were, related by blood to Dionysos; and the radical meaning and intention latent in the zealous cultus of this deity, which was principally pursued in this Orphic college, may have been that man thereby should foster and nourish the Dionysic divine germ pre-existing in him; whilst, on the other side, according to Orphic tradition, the sufferings and misery of mortals were a consequence of their Titanic, or sin-laden original; and souls dwelt in bodies as in prisons or sepulchres,[3] to purge away all the guilt of their earlier being; for which reason no one ought arbitrarily to shorten the period of his earthly purification from Titanic sin-stains by suicide—a doctrine extracted by Philolaus from "the old theologians and seers," by Plato and Jamblichus from the mysteries.

Here, at once, questions arise which are to be immediately answered: What mysteries were these? what was the nature of the Orphic secret rites as a permanent institute? how did the Orphic rites stand towards the mysteries which existed as state institutions? To answer

[1] Diodor. iii. 63.

[2] Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* p. 11; Nonn. *Dionys.* vi. See the passages collected by Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* 553–592.

[3] Plat. *Cratyl.* p. 400; Phædon, p. 62 B; Philolaus, *ap. Clem. Alex. Strom.* ii. 518; Eusitheus, *ap. Athen.* iv. p. 157; Jamblich. *Protr.* viii. p. 53, ed. 1598.

these, a survey of the different forms of the Dionysic worship in Hellas will be first required.

No god had such numerous festivals as Dionysos, and festivals of joy, for the most part, celebrated with extravagant pleasure and jubilant revelry. The little, or country, Dionysia were solemnised with phallic songs, banquets, and dramatic entertainments, at the approach of the vintage. In winter, after they were done with the wine-press, the Lenæa were celebrated at Athens by tasting of the sweet must, with a great banquet and a festal procession, accompanied with banter and ridicule and theatrical representations as well. It is not clear whether the Ambrosia,[1] the name of which festival seems to have reference to sweet must, was on the same day with the Lenæa or a different one. The Anthesteria, or Dionysic flower-feast, was held during three days in the early spring. It consisted of the feast-day of the opening of casks (Pithoiga), the drinking-feast (Choës), and the pot-feast (Chutroi). On the Choës, which was the holiest day, the wife of the archon of Athens, in company with fourteen priestesses, offered a secret sacrifice for the state, and then was symbolically betrothed to the god. On the third day a sacrifice was offered in earthen vessels to the underground Hermes, and to the souls of those who perished in Deucalion's flood.[2] All thronged to Athens at the end of March or beginning of April, to the solemnity of the great or urban Dionysia, which were kept in state, with shows and processions, choirs of youths, and contests of tragic and comic poets. In times of ancient simplicity the procession consisted of a pitcher of wine, a he-goat, a basket of dried figs, and the phallus. Latterly there was a great deal of splendour. Golden baskets were borne by beautiful maidens, the phalli by young men crowned with flowers; these were followed by men in women's clothes, singing phallic songs, and behaving themselves like drunkards. Last came the men with wine-skins and huge drinking-vessels.[3]

[1] Schol. *ad Hesiod. Op. et Dies*, 504.

[2] Schol. *Aristoph. Acharn.* 960, 1075.

[3] Aristoph. *Acharn.* 242, and Schol. v. 260; Ælian. *Var. H.* vi. 1; Athen. 14, 16, p. 622.

In the other Greek countries and cities the Dionysia were in part simple wine-feasts of unlicensed excess, without any mystical rites, as at Hermione in Argolis, where they were celebrated by musical games, and contests of swimming and rowing;[1] the feast Thuion in Elis, where sealed vessels used to be miraculously filled with wine; and that at Pellene, where vessels (for mixing) were placed full of wine all about the city. The observance of the Dionysic festival Skieria, at Alea in Arcadia, was of more importance, where, according to an injunction of the Delphic oracle, women were scourged in the temple of the god, probably to inspire a terrifying remembrance of an earlier Mænad madness;[2] then at Orchomenos, where a nocturnal feast was kept by women and priests, in which search was made for the god, who had disappeared, and to escape the Titans, or some such enemy of his worship as Lycurgus, had hidden with the Muses; and the priests pursued a maiden selected for sacrifice.[3] On the other hand, at Sicyon and Corinth corresponding feasts were solemnised in honour of a double Dionysos of opposite attributes, the one as Bacchus, the other as Lysius,—the one the inspirer of Mænad violence, and the other of gentle calm.

The numberless triennial festivals of Dionysos retained throughout the wild orgic character of the old Thracian Mænad rite. The women kept these by annual excursions to the mountains, where they then spent the nights by torchlight in the exciting dance, and a state always graduating, under the influence of wine, to a higher pitch of licentiousness; and this was the Theban practice on the adjoining mountain Cithæron, and of the Delphian and Attic women in common on Parnassus, though there in a more subdued form.

The cultus of Dionysos Omestes at Chios and Tenedos was quite a deviation from the other Dionysic rites, for human sacrifices were offered to him on these islands adjacent to the Asiatic coast.[4] Here it was the Phenician Baal Moloch, bearing the name Dionysos; and hence

[1] Paus. ii. 35. 1. [2] *Ibid.* viii. 23. 1.
[3] Plut. *Quæst. Rom.* xii.; *Quæst. Græc.* xxxviii.
[4] Porphyr. *de Abstin.* ii. 55.

the Cretan Talos was also designated as his son, being himself of solar nature, and nearly connected with Moloch.[1] If, after the victory of the Hellenes over the Persians, Themistocles had that remarkable sacrifice of Persian prisoners slain to honour Dionysos Omestes, a god not worshipped elsewhere in Greece hitherto, that must be considered as having happened entirely from his desire to do honour to the stranger god, who belonged to a country subject to the Persian sway, in the manner practised on the spot, and to make him propitious to the Greeks.

Thus, then, we find no real Dionysic mysteries anywhere in Greece, if we mean by the term an institution such as the Eleusinian and Samothracian, where people had first to be instructed and initiated in order to be partakers afterwards in the religious arcana. In many instances the Dionysos rite was celebrated by women only. Others, it is true, were observed with ceremonies considered secret, as the sacrifice by the Hosii at Delphi; still, nowhere was there an institute simply based upon the Dionysic cultus on which the Orphic might have engrafted their ritual and dogmatic communications. Even the Bacchanalia, which made their appearance about the year 186 B.C. in Etruria, and afterwards at Rome, had no Orphic, and especially no doctrinal ingredients, but were of a merely ritual character. First established by a Greek priest in Etruria, they were like the trieterica in Greece, only intended for women at their commencement. It was a Campanian priestess at Rome who first introduced the admission of men, and these nocturnal mixed assemblies thereupon became places of disgraceful debauchery, unnatural sensuality, and bloody crimes.

After the times of the Peloponnesian war, notice of the Orpheotelestai, or the initiated of Orpheus, occurs in Greece. They belonged to no established or exclusive company, but standing aloof professed the practice of the Orphi-Bacchic rites on their own account. Provided with Orphic books, and amongst them particularly the secret formulæ written or collected by Onomacritus, they went from town to town tendering their services for pay to rich

[1] Schol. *Apollon. Arg.* iii. 977, where "Tauropolos" is Talos, according to the explanation of Osann (*Rhein. Mus.* 1835, p. 241 sqq.).

and poor in matters of expiation and of healing. Their rites delivered from all penalty of crime, even that which was inherited from ancestors, secured against dangers, and helped to the attainment of a blissful life, and high dignity in the world below. There was nothing arduous, no severe abstinences required; on the contrary, it was the custom to accomplish these expiations and other rites amid amusements and festivities, dancing, and the mimicry of the drunkenness of the Sileni.[1] Many of these jugglers—whose tricks, in spite of their being ridiculed in many ways in the theatre, were eagerly sought after, and paid for, even by those who laughed at them—appear to have declared one single recourse to their rites as sufficient, whilst others recommended a frequent repetition of them, or urged it as absolutely necessary. Theophrastus[2] describes his superstitious man as going every month with wife and children to the Orpheotelests to have the ceremonies done over them. Many, called Metragyrtæ, made use of rites and ceremonies for the purpose borrowed from the Phrygian worship of the "great mother," and combined them with the Dionysic. Besides other advantages, they used to promise the healing of extraordinary diseases, particularly the physical ones, which were considered the work of a god. Not unfrequently they were women who performed these rites; and though the priestess Ninus was put to death at Athens on that account, yet we see the mother of the orator Æschines, Glaucothea, holding the same office as Telestria, or Tympanistria, and the son as the metragyrtes of the mother, reading the holy books in public, putting the nebris, or fawn's skin, on the initiated, dancing before them, giving them mixed wine to drink, and then, in remembrance of the Titans having smeared their faces with clay or chalk at the murder of Zagreus, bedaubing them with clay, and rubbing it off with bran,[3] while he made them repeat the words after him, "I have escaped the evil, and have found the better lot." On the nocturnal rites there followed by day the procession through the streets of the worshippers of Dionysos, in which tricks were played with serpents, and the god was invoked under the titles of Hyes and Attes.[4]

[1] Plat. *Rep.* ii. 364; *Legg.* vii. 815; *Phædr.* 244. [2] *Charact.* xvi.
[3] Harpocrat. p. 54. [4] Demosth. *pro Coronâ*, p. 313.

Where, then, the Dionysic teletai, or orgies, are spoken of, it means either the already mentioned secret rites, merely ritual, and often practised by women; or actual mysteries, which, however, never and nowhere existed alone, but were always connected with the secret worships dedicated to other deities, as was the case in the Lernæa and Eleusinia; or else people understood by them the private inventions of these Orpheotelests and metragyrtæ, who practised their rites according to their own discretion, though perhaps at the same time according to a kind of tradition, and met with greater or less respect, according to their character and cleverness. Many of them invested themselves with the aureole of a special divine inspiration, while others gained their livelihood as common charlatans and adventurers. Many belonged to that class of despised Pythagorists, so called, whose dirt and beggarliness, taken together with the high pretensions they made to especial honours and recompenses in the other world, exposed them to the ridicule of the later Greek comedy.[1] Sometimes numbers united, in order to make their performances more solemn and imposing; then they presented all kinds of frightful images and ghastly apparitions before the eyes of those they initiated, to torture them with the apprehension of Hecate's anger and its terrible effects, and so to induce them to accept the proffered means of protection and remedy more greedily.[2] It was to an Orpheotelest of this kind that Antisthenes answered, when the other exalted the bliss of the initiated after death, "Why don't you die, then?"

Lastly, there were also free religious companies often propagating themselves for a length of time, the members of which were called Thiasotæ or Orgeones. These had for their object the special honour of a deity, generally a foreign one, or Dionysos. As the service of this god attached itself by preference to the "Thiasos and Comos," that is, to festal banquets, dancings, and uproarious music, this sort of Brotherhood was as common as it was popular. Their drinking bouts, enlivened with flute-music and song,—for which often the god only lent his name as a pretext,—

[1] *Aristophontis Pythagoristes, ap. Meineke Com. Gr.* ii. 362.

[2] Hippolyt. *adv. Hær.* p. 72; Dio. Chrysost. *Or.* iv. p. 168, Reisk.; Celsus in *Origen, Opp.* i. 507.

then came, half in jest and half in earnest, to be treated as mysteries, with a certain solemnity and with a few ceremonies of admission.[1]

No further trace of the Orphici as an organised religious body appears, at all events in the period after Plato's time; and when more modern writers[2] speak of a reception into this order with a ceremony of crowning, and of purification with stone-dust, accompanied with singing, this is but what individual women, such as Glaucothea, or itinerant Orpheotelests, did, without further intention of creating an association transferable to an order, which, in fact, did not exist. The Orphic doctrines and myths, however, in Athens itself, had been transferred partially into the public cultus. It is recorded that the Orphic theology and legends were represented at the Dionysia, in the month Anthesterion, with dances, and with the appearance in the theatre of hours, nymphs, and female bacchants.[3] Still the substance of the Orphic theology was, and continued to be, in the mysteries, and particularly the Eleusinia.

The affinity between the Phrygian worship and the Dionysia helps to illustrate this aspect of the nature of the mysteries. Over the whole of Asia Anterior a religion was spread, the prominent figures of which were a great nature-goddess and mother of all living; and a god attached to her as husband, favourite, or son, subject to suffering and death. Experience taught that pain and danger are allied with conception and birth throughout the whole of nature and in the life of man; that beings mutually destroy each other in order to prolong their own existence the one through the other; that new life is ever springing out of death, and the plant drawing its nourishment from corruption, so that the strongest means of support for vegetable life is to be found in the dissolution of animal bodies. This all-absolute, inexorable law of death from life, and life from death, by working upon the imagination of races completely abandoned to natural life, and physically and spiritually under its yoke, had evoked this notion of the gods and the corresponding legends. Man felt himself

[1] Max. Tyr. *Diss.* iii. 7, p. 25; Markland, 1740.
[2] Petersen, *der geheime Gottesd. bei d. Griech.* p. 25.
[3] Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.* iv. 21.

implicated in a perpetual revolution of life and death; to his eyes the universe was a temple and sepulchre, as altar and bier; and so his god, pertaining as he did entirely to the sphere of nature, and limited thereto, must alternately live and die; and if the best and most precious of living creatures were to be offered to him in sacrifice, he too must fall a sacrifice to the great ordinance of death.

The favourite of the great Phrygian goddess Dindymene, or Cybele, was Attes, the son of the god Men, or perhaps Men himself, who in a fit of madness made himself a eunuch, and died of the act, or was put to death. Cybele wandered frantic with grief for his loss about the country, seeking and calling her beloved one. A death-wake was appointed in his honour, to take place every year; but according to the ordinary notion, having been recalled to life, he continued to be the constant companion of the goddess afterwards. As then, if we follow one of the many myths concerning him, the death of Attes was caused by a wild boar, which Zeus sent, so the same fate befell his counterpart, the Syrian and Cyprian Adonis. This Adonis was the paramour of the Syrian Astarte, or Ascherah, or the Asiatic Aphrodite, a goddess of female nature, or nature regarded as conceiving and giving birth, and who bears the strongest resemblance to the Cybele Rhea in her attributes and symbols.[1] The beautiful youth represented as shepherd or hunter, was carried off by the goddess, who was deeply enamoured of him; but he was soon torn from her by sudden death. The loud wailing for his death, accompanied with signs of acutest grief and with the plunging of his image into the sea, together with the unbounded joy consequent upon his being found again, shaped itself into a widespread festival, solemnised throughout the whole of Western Asia, as well as in the islands and in Greece, particularly Athens, and at an early period there. We readily recognise in the beautiful youth, warmly beloved by the nature-goddess and quickly torn from her by death, though again restored alive, the emblem of the alternation of death and life in nature. He was at once symbol of corn germinating in the earth, of fruits swelling

[1] Lajard, *Recherches sur le Culte de Vénus*, p. 75.

to maturity, and of the decay of vegetation from the summer heats and autumnal rain.

Now there is an address to Attes, in an old hymn: "If thou be the progeny of Cronos, or of Zeus, or of the mighty Rhea, hail to thee, O Attes, whom Rhea calls with far-ringing cry. Thee the Assyrians style the thrice-beloved Adonis. In Egypt, Osiris is thy name, horn of the moon in heaven. The Hellenes style thee Ophias, they of Samothrace the divine Adam. Corybas is thy name amongst the Thracians of Hæmus. The Phrygians, last, call thee now Pappas, now the dead one, or the god; and, again, the unfruitful, or the goat-herd, or the young ear (of corn) mowed down, or the flute-player Agdistis, born of the fruit-laden almond-tree."[1]

Therefore, Attes and Adonis, Osiris and Corybas, Zagreus and Agdistis, and Adam, or Esmun, are all in principle one and the same divine being; these are the names which the suffering nature-god bore amongst Assyrians and Phrygians, Syrians and Phenicians, in Egypt and Samothrace, at Lemnos, and in the Greek mysteries. Ophias, *i.e.* the serpent-son, is no other than Dionysos Zagreus, the son of Zeus in form of serpent, a name probably revealed in the mysteries as a secret to be kept. The identity of Zagreus or the hunter as well with Adonis the hunter, as with Attes, was so strong that even the latter name was explained by the *até*, or guilt, of the ruthless deed done by the Titans on Dionysos;[2] the Phrygian Sabazios, who was also called Attes, the one of these two designations only forming a surname to the other, was represented with a bull's horns, like Dionysos; and, according to the account of Diodorus,[3] it was the very Dionysos, the offspring of Zeus and Persephone, who was called Sabazios. Whether Zagreus, as child or boy, be torn to pieces, or Attes, Adonis, Corybas, Osiris, or Esmun, as young men, be enervated and murdered, still the leading idea, which forms the nucleus of the legend, is one and the same throughout: the one as well as the other was a god of life and death: Zagreus returns to life as Adonis does; and Plutarch in his time observes,[4] that Adonis was considered

[1] Hippolyt. *adv. Hær.* 118. 61.
[2] *Etymol. M. s.v.*
[3] Diod. iv. 4.
[4] Plut. *Sympos.* iv. 5. 3.

identical with Dionysos,—a conclusion abundantly corroborated by the conformity of the festivals and rites solemnised in honour of each. Just as in the Orphic teaching Dionysos Amphietes, entombed and sleeping at Delphi, spends the period of his slumbers in the holy abode of Persephone,[1] and is then awakened by the nymphs (the Thyades), *i.e.* summoned up again from Hades, so Adonis, in pursuance of the decree of Zeus, had to live one portion of the year with Persephone below, and the other in the upper world with Aphrodite.[2]

That Osiris is to be discovered again in Dionysos Zagreus, and through him in Adonis and Attes-Sabazios too, is proved by the mutilation of both, and their signification in the infernal world. Later on, Osiris and Adonis were worshipped in one idol at Alexandria;[3] and, if we may believe an old account,[4] the Adonis honoured by the Cyprians was no other than the Egyptian god. As Adonis and Dionysos belonged to Persephone, so, on the shore of the Nile, it was said, Osiris, after he was torn from Isis by death, lay in the arms of the dark Nephthys, the consort of Typhon, the mistress of the lower world, Amenthe.[5]

Corybas, who is compared, not only here, but also by Clemens,[6] with Attes and Dionysos, was the god whom the Thracians of Hæmus and the Phrygians also adored.[7] In the Greek myth he is the son of Cybele, *i.e.* Demeter, and Jasion,[8] or, according to another account, of Persephone, who bore him without a father, that is, his paternity was a secret,[9] in the same way as Zagreus is sometimes reckoned the son of Demeter, sometimes the child of her daughter. Julian calls him the great sun-god,[10] seated at his mother's side; while he is styled the great king in the Orphic theology,[11] who, being put to death and dismembered by his brothers, the other two Corybantes, had taken a serpent form in conformity with Demeter's will. It is clear, then, that he is distinct from the other deities of the same species in name only, and in a few other circumstances of his myth;

[1] *Orph. Hymn.* 53. [2] Hygin. *Fab.* 251; *Orph. Hymn.* 53.
[3] Damasc. *ap. Suid. s.v.* "Heraiscus." [4] Steph. Byz. *s.v.* "Amathus."
[5] Plut. *de Isid.* xiv. p. 24, Parthus. [6] *Protrept.* p. 16.
[7] Hippol. *adv. Hær.* 109. [8] Diod. v. 49. [9] Serv. *ad Æn.* iii. 111.
[10] Julian. *Or.* v. p. 167, Spanh. [11] *Orph. Hymn.* 38.

he too, like Osiris, Attes, Zagreus, and Adonis, was the suffering god of nature, with the solar relation already explained, who must die, and who returns again to life.

Finally, the Samothracian Adam also belonged to the same class of mystery deities. This was the Phenician Esmun,[1] worshipped at Berytus, one of the Cabiri, a beautiful youth roving as a hunter in the mountains, whom the Phenician mother of the gods, Astronoe,[2] fell in love with. Pursued by her, he made a eunuch of himself; but the goddess restored him to life again.[3] It is perfectly clear this Esmun is only the Phenician personation of Attes, or the latter the Phrygian copy of the former.

THE MYSTERIES OF SAMOTHRACE, LEMNOS, THEBES, LERNA, THE ISTHMUS, ÆGINA, AND PHLYA

Now that we have ascertained the principle common to all these Asiatic and Hellenic divinities, of a god of nature violently deprived of the power of generation, dying and resuscitated, we may safely proceed to a nearer investigation of the essence of the Greek mysteries. Only here comes the objection, that the contents of these mysteries did not by any means remain the same at all times, but, on the contrary, many alterations and expansions crept in; so that neither these alterations themselves, nor the date of their introduction, can be historically authenticated. They originated, partly in the differences of natural character, which, by little and little, gained an influence over mystery institutions such, *e.g.*, as the Samothracian, partly too in the interest of the sacerdotal corporations intrusted with their management. While, namely, the public religious system, with its established and legally sanctioned ceremonial, continued in security and peace from its close connection with

[1] Adam = Esmun, according to interchange of the consonants *d* and *s*, which also takes place in the equally Phenician Cadmilos = Casmilos.

[2] In Phenician, Astaroth Naamah, the graceful, or Nemanun, as in Plutarch, *de Iside*, xiii.; Movers, *Phönizier*, i. 636.

[3] Damasc. *Vit. Isid.* 302.

the state, and tenaciously resisted the attempts made by novelties, and the intermixture of many different deities, to shake its stability; the mysteries were always variable in their nature; their tendency relative to another life being, for the most part, foreign to that of the public cultus, was an element impelling to new and more tranquillising ideas, and to the investing of them with a mythical character. "Theocrasy," the overflowing of one deity into another, the gradual melting-down or reduction of the gods to a few beings, but those of extended importance, must needs have found acceptation here; and it was to the interest of the sacerdotal managers not to let sympathies and predilections of the kind flag, and to prevent the institute, by implicit adherence to old ordinances and rites (which would appear far too needy and empty to a new generation), wearing itself out and damaging its respectability; a matter far more urgent and imperative with a people like the Greeks, intellectually so variable as to be almost in perpetual agitation, than with their soberer Oriental neighbours. For though the authority of the mysteries rested, in part, directly on their renown for high antiquity and faithful observance of primitive forms of cultus, established by the gods themselves or their favourites, yet this was certainly no obstacle in the way of blending new with old, and of making ancient forms the vehicle for ideas and interpretations belonging to a later intellectual development. The secrecy, moreover, was a direct protection, and the peculiar names of the deities, in use in the mysteries only, favoured a great latitude of interpretation.

The mysteries of the island of Samothrace owed their widespread renown partly to their high antiquity, losing itself in the obscurity of mythic eld, partly to the credit they had acquired of affording efficient aid in the dangers of life; at least it was said that no one initiated there had ever suffered shipwreck.[1] The investigation of their nature, however, and of the gods worshipped there, forms the mistiest portion of Greek religious history; an obscurity, the cause of which is to be found, in some degree, in the vague undeterminedness and ambiguity of the expressions in use, particularly the names Cabiri and Corybantes; and, further, in the circumstance that the variety of rites, intro-

[1] Schol. *Aristid. Panath.* p. 324.

duced by different races into the island through immigration and the intermixture of population, lay like strata one over the other, and ran into each other: on which account, too, great uncertainty and division of opinions prevailed even in antiquity upon the subject of the Samothracian deities; and, in fact, people could not define with anything like accuracy what the Cabiri really were.[1]

This island had, in truth, been colonised in earliest times by Thracians, but had received a settlement of Pelasgi, on their expulsion from the Peloponnese (Arcadia), and from Attica by the Dorians and Ionians; and thus the old nameless deities of the Pelasgi were still kept up here. Cadmeans of Phenician origin, in like manner, passed over hither from Bœotia; and doubtless the influence of the Phenicians of the mother-country, frequenting all the islands about, extended to the Samothracian religious worship too. Three periods, or constituents, of this worship are recognisable in the sagas. Jasion, whom Demeter cast her eyes upon at the marriage solemnities of his sister Harmonia with the Phenician Cadmus, and who then became Demeter's paramour or spouse in Crete, represents the Cretan element in the Samothracian mysteries. Diodorus says of him, "The initiatory rites had already existed a long time on the island, when Jasion remodelled them according to instructions he received from Zeus, and was the first to initiate foreigners."[2] Then the same legend in Diodorus connects the Phenician influence with the name of Cadmus, who had visited the island and been initiated there. The third and last, the Phrygian constituent, was indicated by the further mythical statement, that it was Cybele whose husband Jasion became, and that he had issue of her the Lemnian Cabirus Corybas.

Varro concluded, from the initiatory rites of the place, that under the designation of "the great gods," that old Pelasgian duality, a god of the heavens, or father of the gods (Zeus), and a female goddess of the earth, or mother of the gods, was worshipped.[3] In the mysteries themselves the male god does not seem to have been further mixed up

[1] Strab. *Fragm.*, *Vat. Maii Coll.* vii. 49.
[2] Diod. v. 48.
[3] Varro, *Ling. Lat.* vi. 88, ed. Bip.

with them, except perhaps in so far as he was the father of Axiokersa. The mother of the gods, however, belonged, as Demeter Axieros, to the real triad of gods in the mystery worship of the place, consisting of Demeter, Coré, and Dionysos, or a god Hades, an equivalent for the Chthonic Dionysos. This much is undoubted,[1] on the joint testimony of Strabo and Mnaseas; the gods whose initiation people received here, according to the account of the latter, were Axieros, *i.e.* Demeter; Axiokersos, *i.e.* Hades; and Axiokersa, *i.e.* Persephone.

The name Cabiri, likewise given to the gods of this mystery worship, serves first of all but to testify to the fact of the high antiquity and non-Hellenic origin of the powers signified. Gods there were under this designation in all the countries lying round the eastern part of the Mediterranean, in Egypt, and Syria, as well as in Asia Minor and Hellas, and as far as Italy itself. The original Semitic name only means "the great," or "the mighty." There were powers of nature, which, like the Pelasgian, had originally no precise designation, in whose case, therefore, in later times (where each god had, or should have had, a more distinct individuality) it remained doubtful what particular deities were intended by them; so that the most various interpretations of them might be current. In most instances a group or family of gods, or demons, eight, generally three, in number, were understood to be meant by it; at times, indeed, only the two first and eldest were indicated, and then the others, who were annexed to the first, later on, and under favour of local relations, here and there. In Macedonia, at Thessalonica, for instance, only a single Cabir was the object of worship.

Very little indeed is known of the Egyptian Cabiric worship. All that is known leads to the conclusion that Phenicia, and Phrygia in the old and wider sense, were the real domiciles of these deities, and that this cultus was conveyed from thence to the islands and into Greece. How strong a claim Phrygia had to be a seat of the Cabiri is shown by the names of the Cabiric mountains, from which many of the ancients—for example, Athenicon and

[1] Strabo, iv. p. 198 (277–8, Oxf.); Schol. *Apoll. Rhod.* i. 917.

Demetrius of Scepsis[1]—derive the names of the deities. A further proof is the new fragment of Nicolas of Damascus, which tells of two young Phrygians with holy things of the Cabiri, which they carried in a chest, coming to the rescue of the inhabitants of the Ionian town Assessus, when in sore distress, and procuring them a victory by bearing the relics before them; whereupon the worship of these divinities, which had hitherto been unknown to the Greeks around, in spite of their Phrygian neighbourhood, was first introduced into Ionia.[2] The Cabiric (Penates) worship must also have been carried into Italy from Phrygia.[3] The sons of Sadyk, or Baal, were, with their father, honoured as Cabiri at Berytus in Phenicia. Esmun was the eighth. The later Greeks assumed this Esmun to be identical with Asclepios, partly because he shared with him the signification of a god of healing and the attribute of a serpent, partly because of his being a son of the Syrian sun-god, and so of Apollo, now current with the Greeks as Helios; but Asclepios was the only one among the gods known as Apollo's son.[4]

The minister of the gods, Cadmilos, a name which Hermes bore here, as also in Bœotia and Etruria, where it was Camillus, was joined to the three already named, Demeter, Hades, and Coré.[5] Represented ithyphallically, he was, with his passion for the under-world goddess Persephone, himself an infernal god, Hermes Eriunios or Chthonios. The signification of this Cadmilos is obscure, and so it gave occasion at first to an almost inextricable confusion in regard to the Samothracian Corybantes, or Curetes, who were also called Cabiri; for, on the one hand, the two first designations were frequently used of one of the bodies of priests consecrated to Cybele, or Rhea; and then again these Corybantes, Dioscuri, or Cabiri, were divine beings, Trabantes, or demons of the great goddess, or even her sons, and thus were of Phrygian origin, although they were also derived from Creta, being con-

[1] *Hist. Gr. Fragm.* ii. 57, iv. 345. [2] *Ibid.* iii. 388.

[3] Dion. Hal. *Ant.* i. 68.

[4] Compare the explanation a Phenician gives in Pausan. vii. 23, with Macrob. *Sat.* i. 20.

[5] *Etym. Gud.* p. 290; Tzetz. *ad Lycophr.* 162, 219.

sidered as identical with the Cretan Curetes; whilst the Phenician Philo declares them to be Phenicians, sons or descendants of the god Sadyk (Baal, or Cronos), and the first inventors of navigation.[1] The Samothracian ones were invoked as spirits of the whirlwind and storm, particularly at sea. Their images, too, stood on a promontory near Brasiæ. Pausanias was not aware[2] whether these were Corybantes or Dioscuri; they were, in fact, both like the Tritopatores worshipped at Athens, the three sons of Zeus and Persephone, two of whom were called Eubuleus and Dionysos (the poetical names of Amalkeides, Protocles, and Protocreon had also been invented for them), and they were likewise wind-spirits, or warders of the winds. People used to sacrifice to these Tritopatores at marriages, to obtain offspring, because, according to Orphic teaching, in the procreation of the body, the soul was carried by the winds and introduced into it.[3] Cicero calls these powers the first Dioscuri; evidently they were genuine Cabiri, and Dionysos, as one of them, had a different signification here from that which is otherwise attributed to him in the mysteries.

Thus is explained the contradiction of two old testimonies brought forward by Strabo, and by him left unsolved. One of these witnesses, Stesimbrotus, probably starting with the notion that the term Cabiri, or "the great and mighty gods," was referable to the triad Demeter, Hades, and Coré, asserted that it was the Cabiri whom the Samothracian worship acknowledged, that these Cabiri were identical with the three Corybantes, and received their name from the Phrygian mountain Cabirus. Demetrius of Scepsis took a contrary view, while declaring there was no mystical teaching about the Cabiri in Samothrace, which means, those three designated by Mnaseas as Demeter, Coré, and Hades, the deities assuming the leading place in the mystery worship, were not the real Cabiri. The true Cabiri were, in fact, the three gods under a male aspect, who were honoured at Samothrace only as demonic beings,

[1] *Fragm. Hist. Gr.* iii. 569; Damascius also (*Vit. Isid.* 302) calls these sons of Sadyk, Cabiri or Dioscuri.

[2] Paus. iii. 24. 4.

[3] Aristot. *de Anim.* i. 5; Stob. i. 52. 863: cf. Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* 753.

and attached to the suite of Cybele, or even considered as her sons, and as powers of the wind and storm, externally to the mystery worship; whereas those of Lemnos, where one of them was called Corybas, were the mystery-gods proper. Stesimbrotus seems to have gone upon the notion that the designation Cabiri, or "the great and mighty gods," was equivalent to the triad Demeter, Coré, and Hades, and then to have discovered Dionysos in Hades, or the god explained as such, and grounded his assertion on that.[1]

Since we know for a certainty that Samothracian secret worship was dedicated not only to Rhea or Cybele, but also to Demeter and Coré, it is clear that Rhea, Cybele, and Demeter, the nature-goddess of the Cretans, Phrygians, and Hellenes, were already blended there. The tragedians had appropriated this Demeter Rhea to themselves from the mysteries, as well as much besides;[2] and hence Rhea was designated *precisely* as the goddess who bore Persephone to Zeus.[3] Who Hades was, we learn from the definite statement, that "Adam" (Esmun) had played the same part in the Samothracian mysteries as elsewhere Adonis, Osiris, or Zagreus.[4] If Aphrodite and Persephone divided between them the love of Adonis, the Esmun imported from Berytus stood in the same relation to the Demeter Cybele of the upper world and the Persephone of the under world. If Attes died in consequence of his self-inflicted mutilation, Esmun had the same fate. It is clear enough, then, how the Cretans could maintain that the Samothracian mysteries contained nothing else in substance but what was subject of public representation with them. They knew that their Zagreus was in essence identical as with Osiris, so with Esmun and Adonis or Attes; and that here, as well as there, the mystery of a god dying and returning again to life was the basis.

The three brothers commemorated in the Samothracian mythology, the sons of Zeus, or Dioscuri, Jasion, Dardanos,

[1] Strabo, x. p. 472 (689, Oxf.).

[2] The passages in Zoego, *Bassi-rilievi*. i. 86.

[3] Athenag. *Leg.* xx.

[4] Hippol. *adv. Hær.* pp. 108–118. The Gnostics there asseverate that Adam was revealed in the mysteries *by name*, and expressly (διαρρήδην) to the initiated, as the first man, or the heavenly prototype of the human race.

and Eëtion, who, according to one legend, were founders of the mysteries on the island, or had spread them beyond it, were nothing but the three Cabiri, or (first) Corybantes. Jasion, the Cretan favourite of Demeter, here of Cybele, and therefore, like Attes in one of the Phrygian sagas, slain by the lightning of Jove, or murdered by his brother Dardanos according to the Lemno-Cabiric saga, appears to have been but a duplicate of Adam or Esmun. His name too is probably but a hellenised form of this Phenician one. If it be asserted[1] that the mysteries revealed the father of the Corybantes, whom the mother of the gods had given birth to, and settled in Samothrace (*i.e.* a second Corybant family), surely that Jasion is intended whom Servius actually names as their father.[2] As Samothrace was a gathering-place for sagas and rites, which came from the most different neighbourhoods, and here intersected and blended, and ranged by one another's side, it might well happen that in the public worship names and relations should occur, which had a different purport in the mysteries, though the forms and their destinies were alike in essentials.

Hermes Cadmilos had probably come thither from another cultus, not unlikely through the Attic Pelasgi, and had been adopted into the Samothracian mystery rite. The Athenians sacrificed to him, to Hermes Chthonios, and to Dionysos, as gods of the nether world, on one of the days of the mystic Anthesterian solemnity, whilst all the other temples were closed, and sacrifice was offered to no other god besides.[3] The position he occupied in the mysteries as ithyphallic god was most likely intended to symbolise the idea that the generative, life-supplying instinct endures still, even in the realms of the dead, and that the germ of life, betraying itself in desire, is the medium and guarantee of the return of the departed into the upper sphere; and it appears that his place in Hades ought to be by the side of the enervated Adonis Attes Esmun (who was unable to respond to the love of the

[1] Diodor. iii. 55. [2] *Æn.* iii. 111.

[3] Didym. *ap. Schol. Aristoph. Acharn.* 1075. The two gods of the lower world to be conciliated, θεοὶ ἐριούνιοι, of whom Antoninus Liberalis speaks, were then probably Dionysos and Hermes. Comp. Steph. *Thes. nov. Paris. s.v.*

goddess), as the god with generative power and desire, but rejected by the goddess.

The secret rite of the grotto of Zerinthos seems to have existed independently of the actual mysteries on the island of Samothrace. We merely know of it that it was celebrated in honour of Hecate, with orgiastic rites and sacrifices of dogs;[1] probably it also resembled the Æginetan rite. But those mysteries were the most renowned and influential the Greeks were acquainted with; though the Æginetan, according to one account, must have been still more indispensable, while the others, the Samothracian, were in particular esteem on the score of their high antiquity.[2] The purple-coloured band which the initiated received and wound round their bodies[3] appears to have been considered as a talisman, protecting against dangers, especially on the sea.

On the island of Lemnos, lying not far from Samothrace, and having an early Thracian and later Pelasgian population, the mystery worship was partially different from that of its neighbour. The cultus of Hephæstos was the prevalent one at Lemnos, from whence Athens had received the god. From him the god of fire, and a goddess of earth called Cabeiro (and Lemnos also), sprang the three Lemnian Cabeiri, who formed the subject of the mystery rite. Hephæstos, therefore, was here what Jasion was at Samothrace. Cybele Demeter was here called Cabeiro; and as Jasion pointed to Crete, so also did Hephæstos, for the Cretans were acquainted with him as the son of their Talos,[4] *i.e.* of the Phenician Baal Moloch, naturalised in their island, like Esmun, a son of Sadyk, god of the sun. In Egypt too the Cabiri were sons of the god corresponding to Hephæstos.[5] One of these sons of Hephæstos, Corybas, was here the god who had to die, and that by the hands of his brothers, who dealt with

[1] Schol. *Aristoph. Pac.* 277.

[2] Schol. *Aristid.* iii. 329.

[3] Schol. *Apollon.* i. 917.

[4] Pausan. viii. 53. 2. Talos, as Moloch, being also identical with Cronos, Hephæstos in like manner is called a son of Cronos in Joan. *Lydus.*

[5] Photius (*Lex.* p. 103) calls the Lemnian Cabiri sons of Hephæstos (for Ηφαίστου must clearly be read for Ἥφαιστοι) or Titans, the last denomination recalling the fact of their having done to their brother what the Titans do to Zagreus in the Orphi-Cretan sagas. What is added (δαίμονες ἐκ Λήμνου διὰ τὸ

him the same way that Typhon did with his brother Osiris, and the Titans with their blood-relation Zagreus. This Corybas, or Cyrbas, whom Diodorus makes a son of Cybele and Jasion, was therefore the form of Attes Zagreus as honoured by the Thracians; and the Tyrrhenian Pelasgi had already received him on the island from the Thracian Sintii. He it is whom an Orphic hymn invokes as the mighty king of the earth, slain by his brothers, the Curetes of the night. He is "the beautiful Cabir of the mysterious orgies, begotten of Lemnos," of Pindar.[1] His death was exhibited in the mystery rite, in which the holy saga told how that the head of the slain, wrapped in a purple veil and adorned with a chaplet, was borne on a brazen shield to the foot of Olympus and there interred; just as in the other legend the limbs of the lacerated Dionysos were interred by his brother Apollo on Parnassus or in Delphi. It is said the two brothers preserved the genitalia of the murdered Cabir in a chest, and carried it, as witness and pledge of the unextinct power of life and generation, into Tuscany, to the Italic Tyrrheni, race-relations of the Tyrrhenian Pelasgi of Lemnos; who therefore were in possession of the legends of the murdered god, and may have stood in the same relation to the Lemnian mystery rite as the Delphian Hosii did to that of Crete. But Corybas was metamorphosed into a serpent by Demeter, and continued to live on under that form;[2] a feature doubtless borrowed from the legend of the mysteries, which the Orphic hymns had preserved, only that Demeter here is probably a later denomination of Persephone or Hecate, arising from the theocrasy so much

τόλμημα τῶν γυναικῶν μετενεχθέντες) sounds like a local tradition of another town, probably Thessalonica, where people claimed to be in possession of the veritable cultus of the Cabiri of Lemnian origin, whose emigration was attached to the well-known tradition of the murder of their husbands by the Lemnian women. Another tradition besides is to be found in Acusilaus (*Fragm. Hist. Gr.* i. 100, and in Hesychius and Steph. Byz. *v.* Καβειρία), which intercalated here the ithyphallic Hermes Cadmilos, as son of Hephæstos, and father of the Cabiri.

[1] *Fragm. ap. Hippolyt. adv. Hær.* 97. According to another account, preserved in Servius, he was son of Persephone without (having) a father, *i.e.* by Zeus, whose paternity, and consequent identity with Hephæstos, was probably a mystery secret of Lemnos. Precisely by this circumstance Corybas is fully identified with Dionysos Zagreus.

[2] *Orph. Hymn.* 39.

in favour in the mysteries, and the Brauronian Artemis, who is an equivalent for these goddesses.

This Lemnian rite was called, by way of distinction, the mystery of the Corybantes; whence this name was applied to the three brothers, as identical with "Cabiri," though but one of them, namely, the murdered one, was really Corybas. The two others were called Alcon and Eurymedon by a later poet, but who had borrowed largely from the mystery sagas.[1] The title Anakto-telestai, borne by the Lemnian mystery priests, shows, moreover, that the three Cabiri were here too called Anakes, the rulers, and were akin to the Tritopatores, who were similarly designated at Athens. The Cabir, who was invoked at Thessalonica with bloody hands,[2] was no other than Corybas. People, it seems, dipped their hands in the blood of the animal sacrificed, to represent the bloody deed of the two brothers.

The mystery rite at Thebes, dedicated to the Cabiric Demeter and her daughter Coré, in a temple only approachable by the initiated, appears to have been very closely related to the Lemnian. The Athenian Metapus, who busied himself much about the orgies and made one or two changes in them, had introduced this rite into Thebes. The three Cabiric brethren, who were here honoured, were clearly identical with the Athenian Tritopatores, only they were set aside by the Eleusinian Iacchos worship supervening, and seem to have almost died out of the knowledge of the people. In Thebes, it was Demeter who handed over the mystical chest to Æteæos, a son of Prometheus, two mythic receivers of the holy relics, corresponding to the Attic names Celeus and Triptolemos. Pausanias durst not mention the contents of the chest, which must have been the genitalia of the murdered Cabir, nor the attendant ceremonies.[3]

The mysteries solemnised at Lerna in Argolis, on the Sinus Alcyonius, traced their descent from Thrace, like other Orphica, or at least came thither by way of Thrace.

[1] Nonn. *Dionys.* xxx. 45. 59. He calls them Corybantes and Cabiri, sons of Cabiro, and makes them brandish the thiasos-like torches of Hecate.

[2] Firmic. Mat. ii. p. 77, Oehler.

[3] Pausan. iv. 1. 5, ix. 25. 5.

A mythical son of Apollo, Philammon of Thrace, was named as their founder; Dionysos, Demeter, and Coré were here too the deities of the initiated; and the whole seems to have had reference merely to the lower world, to the descent into and return from it. Dionysos had to descend into Hades, and cross the lake to bring his mother Semele up. Here then, neither his birth of Zeus and Persephone, nor his dismemberment and death, were made prominent; their place was supplied by the journey to Hades. As the Thyades awoke the sleeping Dionysos while he lingered near Persephone at Delphi, so the Argive women invoked him to come up from out the waters of the lake, whilst they threw into them a lamb for the watcher of the gates of Hades. The phallus, as symbol of vital power and pledge of his return from Hades, was set here upon the tombs; and the Greeks of the place, later on, in keeping with their pæderastic propensities, invented the impure adventures with Prosymnus, in order to explain the symbol of the phallus, and to make a divine model for their sin.[1] Whilst there is hardly any further mention of the Lemnian mysteries in later times, the Lernæan were maintained quite to the close of the heathen system; and Roman ladies of distinction at the end of the fourth century after Christ still continued to have inscribed on their grave-stones that they had been consecrated, not only in Eleusis, but Lerna also, to Liber, Ceres, and Coré.[2]

The Corintho-Isthmian mysteries, dedicated to Melicertes, betray in name and story their foreign (Phenician) origin. Melicertes, with the Grecian surname Palæmon (wrestler), whose native place the Greek myth indicates by making him the grandson of the Phenician Cadmos, through his mother Ino, was the Phenician Melkarth, a solar representation of deity akin to Baal Moloch, for a Moloch offering of children was sacrificed to him also at Tenedos;[3] and at the same time he was like Esmun, a duplicate of Osiris Adonis. Again, he was the god who died and who was bewailed in the Isthmia, and the death

[1] Pausan. ii. 37. 5; Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* p. 29; Tzetzes, *ad Lycophr.* 212.
[2] Orelli, *Inscr.* 2361.
[3] Lycophr. 229–31, and Tzetzes upon the passage, i. 494 sqq.

he met with in the waves of the sea.[1] The solemnities too derived their name from the sorrow of the mother lamenting, like Isis, over her dead son; for as the image of Osiris was annually plunged into the sea, amid loud wailings, and as the head of Osiris Adonis floated to Byblos, so the corpse of Melicertes was borne on a dolphin to land at the isthmus. Sisyphus, the mythic founder of Ephyra (Corinth), or his son Glaucus,[2] were assigned as authors of the Isthmian rite; and as both were legendary representatives of the oldest Corinthian navigation and sovereignty of the sea, there is a further evidence in that of the exotic origin of this worship. On the other hand, the Athenian tradition made out the Isthmia to have been exalted by the Attic hero Theseus, through the addition of athletic combats, into a common Hellenic festival of Poseidon,[3] when before they had only consisted of a nocturnal mystery fête in honour of Melicertes. Nevertheless Melicertes continued to be always the god of the mystery fête, of which Plutarch observes that it contained nothing of special attraction in comparison with the great one of the contested games. The god used to be hid in an adytum which existed there, with an underground entrance.[4] He was represented asleep, as Dionysos Liknites at Delphi; and a black bull was sacrificed to him. Upon the sorrow and lamentation over him, a feast of joy at his resuscitation probably followed in the Isthmian rite. As the myth represents his father Athamas as tutor, or his mother Leucothea as nurse of the Dionysos child, whence madness, persecution, and murder came upon the family, there are indications here of an old struggle between the Mænad rite of Dionysos, and the Phenician cultus of Melkarth, at bottom. Moreover, the Isthmian mysteries may have approximated more closely in form to the Cretan; for it has been mentioned as their peculiarity, that they were the most known, as well as the easiest of access.[5]

Like the generality of mysteries, the secret solemnity at Ægina must have had Orpheus for its founder, and

[1] Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* p. 10; Philostr. *Heroic.* xix. 14.
[2] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* p. 145.
[3] Plut. *Thes.* 25.
[4] Pausan ii. 2. 1.
[5] Schol. *Aristid.* iii. 329, Dindorf.

Origen makes them of equal consideration with the Eleusinian.[1] It was to female deities that a secret worship was annually dedicated here, accompanied with initiation.[2] The leading goddess was Hecate,[3] who was here unmistakably in the place of Persephone, as goddess of the lower world, and sovereign mistress of the realm of shadows, or was identical with her, as she too is styled daughter to Deo, of a powerful father.[4] Sophocles talks of the under-world goddess who conducts the dead in company with Hermes; he could only have meant Hecate by that description, and so this designation appears to be an echo from the mysteries, as so much else in the tragic poets. For Hecate was not only a goddess much worshipped at Ægina, but at Samothrace too, and probably also at Lemnos; in Samothrace an orgic service was solemnised to her honour in the Zerinthian cave; and she seems not to have been distinct there from Axiokersa, or from the goddess Mnaseas calls Coré. People in danger, we are informed, used to invoke the aid of the Corybantes (Cabiri) and of Hecate, as the divinities of Samothrace.[5] At Ægina, where there is mention of two goddesses of initiation, Demeter, as mother of Hecate, was no doubt the other goddess.

These mysteries of Ægina further establish the fact that some features of the Greek mythology were first the product of the mystery worship, and from them gradually made their way into the popular mind. The Greeks have not, like the Egyptians, a god of the first rank, invested with the dignity of judge of the dead; but there are four heroes, who are all connected with the secret rites of their native places, to whom the Greek traditions have intrusted that office, Minos and Rhadamanthus, Triptolemus and Æacus. Minos occurs most frequently as the real judge in Hades, a fact which involves a new proof of the great antiquity of the Cretan mysteries and of the Orphic influence, to which the spread of the Cretan mythology

[1] Pausan. ii. 30; Orig. *adv. Cels.* vi. 290; Lucian, *Navig.* 15.

[2] Compare the above-quoted inscription in Orellius (2361), "Sacratæ apud Ægynam Deabus."

[3] Schol. *Theocr.* ii. 12.

[4] Schol. *Apollon. Arg.* iii. 468.

[5] Schol. *Aristoph. Pac.* 277.

and cultus was owing; the same source is indicated by his countryman Rhadamanthus being assigned to him as assessor in office. As to Æacus, the circumstance of his being connected with Ægina as the hero of the country, and therefore with the mysteries there, was decisive;[1] while Triptolemus attained a like dignity through his relations with the Eleusinians.

The mysteries solemnised at Phlya in Attica to the so-called "great" goddess must have been of the highest antiquity.[2] The expression means the old earth-goddess and great mother, afterwards combined with Cybele and Rhea. Here there was a famous symbolical representation, in interpreting which Plutarch employed himself in his lost work on Empedocles. Amongst other things there was a picture shown here of a hoary old man, winged and ithyphallic, pursuing a female with a dog's head, who was flying before him; this, then, was a Hermes Cadmilos and a Hecate Brimo, or Hecate Persephone, also represented, as is known, with a dog's head, whose mutual relation had the most intimate bearing on the Samothracian mystery.

THE ELEUSINIAN MYSTERIES

As Athens far surpassed other Hellenic cities in intellectual matters, so too her mysteries, the Eleusinian, had the precedence of all institutions of the kind. They owed this, in part, to the fame of Athens, and in part to the artistic splendour and tasteful beauty of their scenic ornamentation, and in some degree also to the care the Athenians took in cherishing the belief that those who were initiated there acquired the securest guarantee of bliss in the other world. Since the union of Dionysos with the cereal divinities, Demeter and Coré, formed the

[1] Plato, I believe, is the only Greek who styles him "judge of the dead," and in particular of Europeans, *Gorg.* p. 523. The Romans make more frequent allusion to his office: Ovid. *Met.* xiii. 25; Horat. *Od.* ii. xiii. xxii. Plato, *Apol.* p. 41. Bip., is also acquainted with Triptolemus as judge of the dead.

[2] Hippol. *adv. Hær.* p. 144. Here instead of λεγομένη μεγαλημορία, τὰ τῆς λεγομένης μεγάλης ὄργια is to be read; and instead of the corrupt φλοιᾶς ἰονόργια, p. 145, we must substitute φλιασίων ὀργία.

characteristic feature of the Eleusinia, we may be certain they were derived, as to one component at least, from Thrace. A Thracian colony under Eumolpus, himself genealogically related to Orpheus through Musæus, whose son he was, had established them, or at least expanded and perfected them; and the Lycomidæ, who in the time of Pausanias (about the year 130 A.D.) were in hereditary possession of the office of torch-bearing in the Eleusinia, then used Orphic hymns at the initiation.[1] In Athens itself, at least in the time of Aristophanes and Euripides, it was the prevailing idea that what was holiest in the mysteries originated with Orpheus; and thus people were generally accustomed to distinguish as Orphic, or to derive from Orpheus, whatever in the secret cultus referred to the world below and to the existence after death.

The Eleusinia as a whole formed a great solemnity, lasting at least ten days, when much passed in public before all eyes, the magnificence of which always drew to Athens a crowd of people, including many who had no desire to be initiated. Feast and mystery were treated as an institution of the state, and therefore were under the direction of the republic. The great council of five hundred was charged with the observance of ordinances, and, according to a law of Solon, met together every year just after the festival, to pass sentence upon any transgression of them that had occurred during the time. It was a series of manifold customs, purifications, sacrifices, expiations, dramatic dances, choral song, and orgies, divided between Athens, Agræ, and Eleusis, all of which were connected more or less closely with the real subject-matter of the mysteries, namely, the religious theatrical entertainment, representing the sorrows and deeds of the three deities. Much of this was done in the open air; and all could be spectators, as the ritual functions took place in the Thriasian plain, at springs, or on the sea-shore; while the part kept secret was exhibited in the mystery buildings at Eleusis, the Anactoron, or Telesterion, only accessible to the initiated.

All this was under the management of four leitourgoi, belonging to the two old sacerdotal families of the

[1] Pausan. i. 14. 2, ix. 27. 2.

Eumolpidæ and Ceruces, of the Hierophant, the Dadouchos (or torch-bearer), the Herald, and the Epibomius (or minister of the altar). The hierophant, assisted by a hierophantess, was no ordinary priest. It was his business, with the assistance of others, and some priestesses, by a series of representations artfully arranged, which, by sudden surprises and well-calculated and striking contrasts, produced powerful effects of agitation and tension, to set before the eyes of the spectators the adventures of their deities, their wondrous might, the evident signs of favour they bestowed on the inhabitants of Eleusis and Athens, and the still greater vouchsafed to the initiated. It was also his office to exhibit the holy symbols and pictures, which were covered up, and only unveiled for a few moments. In common with the dadouchoi, whose chief function it was to bear the torches at the sacrifices, he pronounced aloud the directions and formulæ, or holy sayings; he also intoned the hymns, and therefore it was specially required he should have a clear sonorous voice.[1]

The invention of agriculture was probably introduced into the Eleusinia at a later period. The oldest record of this secret worship is the Homeric hymn to Demeter, the author of which lived not long after Hesiod, perhaps about the thirtieth Olympiad, and seems to have belonged either to the Eleusinian priest circle or to the initiated. In this there is no reference to agriculture. Only the wanderings of the mother in quest of her daughter, the effects of her anger and sorrow in spreading sterility, and the reunion of the two goddesses, are described; and particular prominence is also given to the mother having taught the heroes of Eleusis the sacrificial rite and the orgies. This, and not the invention of agriculture, is the great beneficial act of Demeter here panegyrised. It is the initiated, without any regard to agriculture, on whose houses wealth is showered by the goddess; and all who neglect to honour Persephone with sacrifice and holy gifts are menaced with an eternity of misery. The intention is clearly shown in the hymn to represent the mysteries of the cereal goddess as an offspring of the soil, not brought thither from without, but imme-

[1] Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* ii. 20.

diately granted by the goddess herself to the old country heroes of Eleusis. All is calculated for the glorification of Eleusis as the actual spot selected by the goddess, and consecrated by her own habitation there, for the lavishing of her favours and for her worship. The association of Eleusis with Athens, so important for the perfection of the mystery solemnities, is not alluded to. External influence, Thracian and Samothracian, as well as Athenian, is thereby repudiated, or only indicated as of a later accession. There is no trace to be found of Dionysos or Iacchos; the design to make everything that regarded this cultus seem a later and foreign addition is transparent. This was done in the interest of the old Eleusinian families in opposition to Athens, where people sometimes indicated Orpheus, sometimes Eumolpus, who was from Thrace, or his sons Phorbas and Immaradus, as authors of the mysteries. A special legend is attached to Phorbas, which points to an early derivation of the Attic mysteries from Samothrace or Lemnos. He is confounded with Jasion, the mythical founder of Samothracian worship; the story being, that, as favourite of Demeter, he was struck with lightning by Zeus, as were Jasion and Attes.

On the other hand, the Demeter hymn would make Eumolpus appear a native of Eleusis, by inserting him between Celeus, Diocles, and Triptolemus, and not even admitting him to take part in the orgies proper, or the mystery rite of the goddess, but only in the direction of the public sacrifices and ceremonial.[1] On similar grounds of local interests, a later Orphic poem designates Eumolpus, Eubuleus, and Triptolemus as the three "earth-born" sons of Dysaules and Baubo, to whom Demeter appeared;[2] and Ister maintained it was not the Thracian Eumolpus known at Athens who was the originator of the mysteries, but another of the same name, a grandson of the aboriginal Eleusinian Triptolemus.[3] Even the Musæus, who was substantially concerned in the Eleusinian cultus, according to one tradition, was a native of Eleusis, and a Thracian according to another. To favour the same interests, and the claims of the Eleusinian families, a convention, con-

[1] See Voss on the *Homeric Hymn*, p. 139.

[2] Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* p. 6.

[3] *Fragm. Hist. Gr.* i. 420.

cluded after an old war between Athens and Eleusis, was invented, by which Eleusis was incorporated in the Athenian state; but the priestly families there were to remain in exclusive possession of the administration of the mysteries and holy things. One sees, then, why there should be a sepulchre of Eumolpus in existence at Eleusis as well as at Athens; and why, further, Ceryx, the ancestor of the family of Ceryces, should have had himself inserted in the sacerdotal family at Eleusis as claiming to be son of Eumolpus against the will of the family, which pretended to descend from Hermes and the Athenian Pandrosos.[1]

Thus the two traditions were contradictory; the one would represent the Eleusinia as a pure aboriginal local rite, that had arisen on the identical spot, and owing institution immediately to the supreme goddess. The other would have the whole of the secret rite, including the three deities, to have been imported from Thrace, but less immediately than through the islands adjacent to the Thracian coast. Thus much, however, is certain, that the Eleusinia were an ancient cultus, dating beyond the time of the Ionian migration from Attica into Asia Minor; for in their migration the Ionians transferred this already existing worship to their new home; so that the ancient and noble families of the Celidæ and Androclidæ at Ephesus continued in possession of it there, while tracing their descent from Athens. The silence of Homer proves nothing against this view. But whether Dionysos was so very early associated with the two goddesses in cultus, and when that association took place, on these points, historically speaking, there is nothing decisive to be advanced.

Dionysos, or Iacchos, is the most enigmatical personage in the Attic mysteries. The assertion that Iacchos and Dionysos were identical, and that he was the resuscitated Zagreus, has been emphatically denied lately;[2] but to accept this would make an understanding of the Eleusinian worship impossible; and the fact that Iacchos is no other than the son of Zeus and Coré, called back again to life, is so strongly supported from many quarters that we may rely upon it with all security. Lucian says that the

[1] Andron. in the *Fragm. Hist.* ii. 351.

[2] *E.g.* by Fritzsche, *de Carm. Aristoph. Myst.*, Rostock, 1841, pp. 20 sqq.

laceration of Iacchos was represented by the orchestra;[1] and we learn that Athens distinguished herself by the worship of a Dionysos, who was not the one ordinarily honoured by the Greeks formerly, but an older one, who was son of Zeus and Coré, and that a hymn was sung to this Dionysos, the Iacchos of the mysteries, or one of the same name as that god, and not the Theban god (the son of Semele).[2] Sophocles even allowed himself to call Iacchos the bull-horned,[3] not knowing any difference between him and Zagreus, though it was not the resuscitated one, but only the child Zagreus before his death, who was represented with this emblem in the mysteries.

This mystery-god Iacchos was in himself and in his origin quite distinct from the Thracian wine-god, whom the Thebans had appropriated by inscribing him into the genealogies of their country sagas; so distinct that Cicero[4] unhesitatingly held him, the said Iacchos, to be identical with the old Italian Liber, who, forming a group with Ceres and Libera, had, to his mind, nothing in common with the son of Semele. In the same sense, Strabo discriminated between the Theban Dionysos, and "the demon" the introducer of the Demeter mysteries, as being two separate beings, Iacchos being regarded as choragos of the festal procession consecrated to the god, who had transplanted the mystery solemnity from Athens to Eleusis. This distinction comes out clearest in Aristophanes,[5] where the son of Semele plays a ridiculous part on the stage, the poet making him listen whilst the initiated sing hymns of praise to Iacchos.

That the relation of the mystic Dionysos to the Theban, or of the son of Persephone to the son of Semele in the Attic mystery rite, remained long unexplained, and the contradiction unsolved, is evident from the numerous uncertain and hesitating assertions of the ancients, who

[1] *De Saltat.* v. 147, Bipont.
[2] Arrian, *Exped. Alex.* ii. 16. 3.
[3] *Ap. Strabo.* x. p. 468 (682, Oxf. ?).
[4] Cic. *N. D.* ii. 24.
[5] ὧν (μυστηρίων) τῆς τελέτης οὐ μόνον χορευτὴς ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔξαρχος ἦν ὁ Διόνυσος, says the scholiast to Aristoph. *Ran.* 363, so explaining ἀρχηγετής, the expression of Strabo, who calls Iacchos the "demon," or a divine being in general, as the Cabiri were termed δαίμονες περὶ τὴν Ῥέαν. *Etym. Gud.* p. 289. There is no call upon one, then, to understand from this passage of the geographer a "mystery genius" unknown to the whole of antiquity.

dared not assert that the two were one,[1] or who explained them outright as two entirely different beings. Later on, however, the Orphic version, invented for the purpose of reconciling the contradiction, prevailed; Zeus had given Semele the heart of Zagreus to eat, or had himself swallowed it, so that the son of the daughter of Cadmus was begotten of the substance of the first Dionysos. Iacchos was actually addressed as Semele's son in the Lenæa throughout.[2] With *this* was combined the further doctrine, that men arose from the ashes of the Titans when sated with the flesh of Zagreus; which makes the better intellectual part of man to be of Dionysic origin.[3] A still later gloss, concerning which we cannot decide, whether it made its way into the Eleusinia, or remained external to them, is that produced in Nonnus; according to which the son of Semele, who sprung from the heart of the first Dionysos, or Zagreus, by a rape committed on the Titanid Aura in Phrygia, became father of the third Dionysos, the Eleusinian Iacchos, to whom the Athenians paid the same honour as they did to Zagreus and the grandson of Cadmos.[4]

The Orphic hymn represents the Eleusinian Iacchos as of both sexes;[5] this corresponds with his Asiatic proto- and anti- types. The Phrygians called their Attes "the barren," and represented him as a eunuch. Agdistis, the flute-player, born of the almond-tree, was hermaphrodite, as the hymn in Hippolytus styles him. The generative member was wanting both in Osiris and Corybas at Lemnos. Adonis was similarly figured after his recall to life. By their death they had become gods of the lower world, and represented, it is true, the idea of life after death, or rather the resuscitability of life; but for this very reason they have not themselves the power of procreation, but as resuscitated beings lead a sexless existence. Thus, Iacchos

[1] Compare the expressions of the schol. to Aristoph. *Ran.* 324.

[2] Schol. *Arist. Ran.* 480. [3] Dio. Chrysost. *Or.* xxx. 550.

[4] Nonn. *Dionys.* xxiv. 48, xlviii. 238 sqq. In this representation the expression of the scholiast to Aristid. p. 213, is explained, that Iacchos, "as some few said," was the son of Dionysos, *i.e.* of him of Thebes.

[5] *Orph. Hymn.* 42. Iacchos is here styled "Mises," as an hermaphrodite being. He indulges in impurity in the temple at Eleusis, or in the mystical rite of Phrygia, with the Mother (Attes), or in Cyprus with Aphrodite (Adonis), or with his mother Isis in Egypt (Osiris).

was not consort of Persephone, or Demeter, nor identical with Pluto. The three male Chthonic deities seem to have been representations of three ideas;—the veritable death-power, in Pluto; the generative power, remaining still in death, in the ithyphallic Hermes; the reawakening to life, and the new life (without sex), in Iacchos.

If we now proceed to prove in its detail the course and contents of the Attic mystery solemnity, we shall certainly meet with much that is obscure and doubtful, though the principal portions still admit of being verified. There were, properly speaking, three separate and yet intrinsically connected mystical dramas; each was distinct from the other in place, time, and subject, and all, in a wider signification, were called the Eleusinia; and with the preparations thereto, the sacrifices and processions formed the whole solemnity. They were called the Eleusinia, though the two last only took place at Eleusis, the first being conducted at Agræ near Athens. In order to assist at all the three, two years at least were necessary.

The opening of the function was made by the proclamation, that the impure, meaning such as, on account of some heavy crime, murder for instance, had not yet made atonement, and all non-Hellenes besides, were excluded from the mysteries. The solemnity of the lesser mysteries of Agræ, which served at the same time as a purifying preparation for the larger, fell in the month Anthesterion (at the end of February and beginning of March). They were called the mysteries of Persephone,[1] and also of Dionysos.[2] The birth of the latter, whom Zeus in the form of a serpent begot of his own daughter Persephone, appears to have been the first subject brought forward in this division of the secret rite. Tatian quotes, as evidence for the incest of father with daughter, "Eleusis and the holy

[1] Hippol. *adv. Hær.* p. 116; Schol. *Aristoph. Plut.* 846.

[2] Steph. Byz. *v. Agra: τὰ μικρὰ μυστήρια—μίμημα τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον.* These are *τὰ σεμνὰ τῆς Κόρης μυστήρια*, to the celebration of which Demeter came with Demetrius to Athens, as is said in the ithyphallic song in Athenæus (vi. p. 253, ii. 47, Schw.). Nonnus, who was conversant with Dionysic matters (xxvii. 305), says that Athens, after the Bacchus of the Lenæa, would have the Phrygian rhythm intoned to the Dionysos of Eleusis, and he has followed the calendar exactly. The Lenæa, the feast of Dionysos, *ἐν Λίμναις*, took place in Gamelion, and therefore in the previous month; then followed the little mysteries, which, according to this testimony, were also in honour of Dionysos.

serpent."[1] This creature generally played a conspicuous part in all mysteries, and was here the symbol of Zeus, and of the union which gave birth to Zagreus. Next followed the orchestral representation of the murdering and dismemberment of the child-god by the Titans, and the revenge inflicted by Zeus on the perpetrators of the deed.[2] The words of Clement seem to apply to this part of the mysteries: "The hierophant must extinguish the fire, and the dadouchos remove the torches, for the light unveils the outrage done on their Iacchos."[3] We may assume with the greater certainty that the Creto-Orphic myth of Zagreus was really exhibited in the little mysteries, as his birth necessarily required its further complement of the tragical fate of the boy. The symbols enumerated by Clement as exhibited in this portion of the mysteries—the dice, ball, top, mirror, and apple—were to signify the toys with which the Titans had allured the child into their power.

The third act of the lesser mysteries appears now to have been the restoration to life, by Demeter, of the murdered Zagreus, whose remains Apollo had buried. For Diodorus, who states that the goddess put the lacerated members together, says the matter was so represented as well in the Orphic poems as in the ceremonies of the mysteries; but that he was not allowed to reveal the details to the uninitiated.[4] But Demeter completed the restoration of Iacchos to life, not merely by putting the limbs together, but also by giving her maternal breasts to the child, and by her divine milk pouring a new stream of life into him. On that point the passages in Suidas, Lucretius, and Arnobius leave no room for doubt.[5]

Six months later, in the month Boëdromion (the end of September or beginning of October), the great mysteries, or those of Demeter, the actual Eleusinia in the more

[1] Tatian, p. 38, Ottf.

[2] Compare the passage cited above from Lucian about the laceration of Iacchos, and the one just mentioned of Steph. Byzant.

[3] Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* p. 6.

[4] Diod. iii. 62.

[5] Ἴακχος is explained in Suidas, Διόνυσος ἐπὶ τῷ μαστῷ. The passage of Lucretius, iv. 1161, "At gemina et mammosa Ceres est ipsa et Iaccho," implies hat Demeter was represented with full breasts on account of Iacchos (cf. Arnob. iii. 10, p. 133, Oehler); and Iacchos himself is styled ὑποκόλπιος in the *Orphic Hymns*, 52. 9, for the same reason.

restricted sense, were solemnised. These were divided again into two rites for the mystæ, separated by a considerable interval. According to one account, and a very much controverted one of Tertullian,[1] we must assume that the initiated who had already passed through the less, and the first division of the greater mysteries, were only admitted after five years to the last, or consummating, rite of Epopteia, or inspection. If such was the rule,[2] many exceptions were made to it in favour of distinguished or powerful strangers. The agyrmos, or assemblage of the mystæ on the first day, formed the introduction to the great mysteries. On the day following the proclamation was made, "To the sea, ye initiated," upon which people drew off for lustration to two salt-water lakes, dedicated to the two goddesses, and near the sea. After sacrificial rites of some length followed the joyful procession, which conducted Iacchos fresh risen to a second life, along the holy road from Athens to Eleusis, a distance of four hours. This removed the scene of the solemnity to Eleusis from Athens. As they passed over the river on the way, fresh lustrations were made. On the bridge over the Cephisus, the so-called gephyrism took place, *i.e.* extravagant pranks were played, and ridiculous abuse of one another was interchanged.

The mystery action in Eleusis consisted of the adventures of Demeter and her daughter. Iacchos, now grown into a stripling, had become the Paredros[3] (assessor) and companion of the goddess to whom he was obliged for his new life, just as the resuscitated Attes, or Adonis, is conceived to be, or represented as, Paredros and favourite of Cybele, or Aphrodite. The rape of the young goddess was the first dramatic exhibition. Whilst she is gathering flowers in the meadows, Coré is carried off by Pluto, or Hades, suddenly appearing out of the earth, and is taken down into his realm. Probably this is the moment, mentioned by a late Christian author, at which the dark abyss, by which the descent into Hades is made, discloses

[1] *Adv. Valent.* 1.

[2] One year only is assigned as the interval till the Epopteia. Schol. *Arist. Ran.* 744. Compare Seneca, *Quæst. Nat.* vii. 31.

[3] So Pindar already styles Dionysos, *Isth.* vii. 3.

itself to the terrified spectators, when the hierophant (as Pluto) is discovered alone in the gloom with the priestess (as Proserpine), and the whole assembly "patiently waited for their blessing from the acts of the pair in the artificial night."[1] After this, the wanderings of Demeter in search of her daughter, and the sorrow and lamentation of the despairing mother, were represented. In this the mystæ took an active part in person, running about the whole vigil, waving torches upon the Thriasian plain on the shore of the Eleusinian bay as if in quest of Coré.[2]

Demeter comes sorrowing to Eleusis, and reposes by a spring there (on which account the initiated were forbidden to sit by it), and is enlivened by the shameless action of Baubo and Iacchos. That this was actually represented we have the assertion of Clemens, of whom there is every ground for believing that he was himself initiated; and also that of a contemporary work, written, not for Christians, but for pagans, at a time when the danger which Christians incurred must have made them doubly circumspect as to what they said.[3] Not improbably this act of exposing female nakedness was an old and peculiar religious ceremony, which the Orphici first connected with the cheering up of the disconsolate goddess; a custom which was also practised in Egypt by the women at the festival of Bubastis, the daughter of Isis, herself nearly allied to the Greek Demeter.[4] The rest of the circumstances, with the behaviour of Iacchos, and the myth regarding them, were after-fabrications of a similar stamp to the filthy Lernæan saga about Prosymnus, invented for the interpretation of the phallus symbol. The mystæ also, who had hitherto been fasting for nine days, after the example of the goddess, now also tasted as she did the mixed drink (*κυκεών*), by which they obtained at the same

[1] Aster. *Encom. in SS. Mart.* ii. 193; Bib. Max. PP. (Despont.) v. 834.

[2] Lactant. *Instit.* i. 21–24; Stat. *Silv.* iv. 8. 50.

[3] Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* p. 6. Fritzsche (*de Carm. Aristoph. Myst.* p. 31) has explained how Arnobius (v. 25), who there copies Clement, fell into his mistake regarding Iacchos.

[4] Heredot. ii. 60. The Lycian women seem to have had the same custom, for Plutarch (*de Mul. Virt.* vii. ix. Wyttenb.) tells of their having appeased the anger of Poseidon *ἀνασυράμεναι τοὺς χιτωνίσκους*, and so saved their country from an inundation.

time the right of admission to the completing rites of initiation.

But there was yet another and a similar act represented in the mysteries, and attached to the appearance of the goddess in Eleusis. For the Creto-Samothracian legend, that Demeter had abandoned herself to a passion for Jasion, and from him conceived Pluto, had been domesticated at Eleusis in this way, that the old hero of the place, Celeus, into whose house the goddess was received, had been substituted for Jasion. In gratitude for information concerning her daughter's rape, she had surrendered herself to him (Celeus) with a repetition of the behaviour of Baubo. This too was described in Orphic verses;[1] and one who must have learnt it from eye-witnesses assures us in two places in his writings that this very exhibition still took place at Eleusis in his time, about 381 A.D.[2]

The meeting of mother and daughter did not take place in the same way in the mysteries as in the Homeric hymn, where Persephone, released from her husband at the bidding of Zeus, comes up into the upper world; whereas in the Eleusinia, Demeter descends, "accompanied by the holy youth," into Hades, where Iacchos shows her "the sacred nuptial couch of the Chthonic Zeus."[3] This descent of Demeter is mentioned by Clemens, who observes, that in the representation of the disappearance of the two goddesses, swine were made to go down with them.[4] Here is the ground on which Herodotus explained Isis (who in

[1] Comp. the verse in Gregor. Naz. *Or.* iv. *Opp.* Paris, 1779, i. 141. Thus are explained the benefits mentioned by Isocrates (*Panег.* 6, p. 59) as conferred by Demeter on their ancestors, and which could not be made known to any but the initiated. Isocrates expressly distinguishes these from the gift of corn.

[2] Greg. Naz. *Or.* iii. 104 (141 D), xxxix. 625 D. Lobeck (*Aglaoph.* p. 824) has the two passages, but has omitted to quote in the latter the words *καὶ ποιεῖν τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην μυστήριον*. The word must be *ποιεῖ*, the orator breaking off his sentence with the remark that he was ashamed of giving a precise description of the nocturnal mystery. The passage in the Orphic hymn concerning the mother Antæa (Demeter) having given way to human passion, and given birth to Eubulos, probably has reference to her liaison with Celeus.

[3] *Orph. Hymn.* 41 (40), v. 6, where, however, the name Δυσαυλοῦ is first inserted by the new editor. The text of Gessner has *Δύσαγνος* (Δυσάγνη) *παῖδ' ἀγνὸν ὁδηγητῆρα λαχοῦσα*. The boy who serves as guide in the under world is plainly Iacchos, and not a son of Dysaules, and is called *ἁγνος* because ignorant of the commerce of love.

[4] *Protrept.* p. 11 (? Tr.).

Egypt was queen of the nether world with Osiris) to be identical with Demeter; and Æschylus too, following in the same track, made Artemis a daughter of Demeter, as she passed for the Egyptian Bubastis, the daughter of Isis.

This going down of Demeter into Hades, and the reunion of mother and daughter connected with it, appear to have belonged to the third principal division of the Attic mysteries, or to the second Eleusinian drama of the Epopteia. Accordingly Hades and its inhabitants were the last, and without doubt the most brilliant, scenic representation offered the epoptæ to crown the whole. Upon this especially, tasteful Athens seems to have lavished all the wealth of her theatrical and artistic resources, so that the impression left behind by it on the mind of the spectator was profound and ineffaceable. We shall have no difficulty now in understanding the description of Plutarch:[1] "First, losings of the way and tedious rambling about, and anxious, objectless wanderings in the darkness; then, before the close, all kinds of terrific things, horror and trembling, sweat and anguish; then a burst of wondrous light, pleasant spots and meadows, welcome us: we hear voices, see dances, and receive the solemn impress of holy words and appearances." Therefore Himerius speaks of the longing for the "Eleusinian fire," which had attracted the Scythian Anacharsis to the mysteries. The terrors of Tartarus having been first shown to the epoptæ, enhanced the effect of the immediately subsequent exhibition of the pleasures and enjoyments there destined for the friends of the goddesses, and for the initiated.

Two actions of the last division of the Attic mysteries, or Epopteiai, are still preserved to us, the proper place of which in the whole function, however, is matter of uncertainty: the one is the exclamation of the Hierophant, "The sublime Brimo has brought Brimeus into the world"; in other words, "The strong one has given birth to the strong."[2] This is confirmatory of a statement taken from an old source,[3] that Brimo was a name of Persephone; for it could only be the birth of Zagreus Iacchos which was

[1] *De Animâ, Fragm.* vi. 2 (v. 725, Wyttenb.).
[2] Hippolyt. *adv. Hær.* 115.
[3] *Etymol. M. p.* 213. 49.

alluded to. We may suppose that only on the meeting of the son with the mother in Hades, this circumstance, which had been already signified in the little mysteries, was again solemnly announced in the Epopteiai. The second action, derived from the same source, is this: an ear of corn, plucked in silence, was exhibited to the epoptæ as the great object, wonderful and perfect, of mystical contemplation. This symbol, as the authority observes, was borrowed from the Phrygian cultus. "The yellow-reaped ear:"[1] it was thus the Phrygians styled their Attes, as they also called him the "dead," or the "barren one"; Adonis too bore the name of Abuba, the ear.[2] It was exhibited accordingly as the symbol of the god, prematurely killed, but, like the ear enclosing the seed-corn, bearing within himself the germ of a second life, and doubtless, too, as the symbol of the immortality assured to the epoptæ.

The sacred objects played a great part in the Attic mysteries. These had reference to the three deities and their histories, and were shown about in the mystic chests and touched. Some were given to the mystæ, either to consume at once—a kind of communion—or to keep as a memorial or amulet; and this in reality was the definitive act of initiation. In the great mysteries, there were several kinds of cakes, sweetmeats in many shapes, sesame, grains of salts, pomegranates, little wands, ivy, and poppy;[3] the latter probably in memorial of the cure wrought with it by Demeter on Triptolemus when sick; the pomegranates because Persephone was made over to the under world for having eaten them; ivy as the attribute of Dionysos; the grain of salt and the sweetmeats as tokens of the better kind of life and the milder nourishment introduced by Demeter.

The formulæ quoted by Clemens were to be pronounced by each of the mystæ. They served, it seems, as shibboleths, by which the mystæ were known as such and admitted to epopteia. They ran thus: "I have fasted; I have drunk the mixed drink (cuceon); I have taken it out of the chest, have spun, have placed it in the basket, and

[1] χλοερὸν στάχυν ἀμηθέντα, Hippolyt. p. 118.
[2] Hesych. *s.v.* : comp. Jablonsky, *Opusc.* iii. 108.
[3] Clem. Alex. *Protrep.* p. 6.

from the basket laid it in the chest."[1] The gesture too of spinning wool appears to have been an imitation of what Demeter did in the time of her affliction,[2] and at the same time to have been acknowledged as relating to the improvement of domestic life and work attached to the name of the goddess.

The phallus too was exhibited in the Attic mysteries: Tertullian says this distinctly;[3] and in corroboration of him Diodorus certifies us, that this symbol was not only honoured in the Dionysic feasts, but in all other mysteries.[4] Most likely it was the case that in the little mysteries the phallus was exhibited as the member of the mutilated Zagreus which had escaped the fury of the Titans (like that of Osiris, and of the Cabir murdered by the brothers), and was preserved in the mystic chest under a symbolical name. The great mass of the heathens were not in the habit at any time of taking offence at this figure. Accustomed to the sight of the Hermæ, and suchlike things, from their youth up, the imagination of the Greeks ceased to be easily excited by it. People only saw in it the symbol of nature's generative power; and why should that appear to them offensive in the mysteries which they had before their eyes every day and everywhere?

The Eleusinian pageant became at last, at the close of the epoptic arcana, public again, and open to all, as it had begun. There followed sacrificial feasts, bull-fights, and other contested sports. The prize of the victor was a vessel of sacred barley. The whole was concluded with the plemochoai (earthen water-vessels), two of which were

[1] ἐργασάμενος, for which Lobeck and all the moderns after him, O. Müller and Prœller inclusive, would substitute ἐγγευσάμενος: my belief is the word is an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον; it occurs in Polyb. vii. 13. 7, of blood. Would a word of such rare occurrence have been used in one of the ordinary formulæ of the mysteries? According to the account of Epiphanius (*Opp.* 1092), one of the holy symbols was ἐρέα ἐξειργασμένη, wrought or spun wool: this explains ἐργασάμενος; for in the latter mysteries undressed sheep's wool (πόκος) appeared; and Lobeck, when altering the text, would certainly have liked to set this aside too. Now if spun wool was one of the symbols in the last, or epoptic, mysteries, it is clear that in the preceding mysteries the mystæ had taken the raw wool out of the basket, and imitated the action of spinning, and then replaced it in the chest.

[2] She had taught the women in the household of Celeus manual works of women. *Hymn. in Cer.* 144.

[3] Tert. *adv. Valent.* i.

[4] Diod. iv. 6.

on this day filled with water, and the one poured out towards the east, and the other to the west.[1] The mystical formula[2] used on the occasion was not improbably the one attested by Proclus and Hippolytus,[3] "Rain! Bear!" the first word being uttered with the face raised heavenwards, the other with it inclined to the earth.

On turning back again to the triple drama of the Attic mysteries, we see clearly why the lesser mysteries were sometimes called those of Persephone, sometimes those of Dionysos, and why, further, the ancients often expressed themselves about their contents as if they had been the Dionysic mysteries proper, which, however, had no existence as an independent institute, as has been already shown; and therefore one must take as such the Sabazia, which were celebrated here and there in Greece, only in the way of mere private enterprise, and whose principal god was identified with Dionysos. The Dionysic mysteries at Agræ could not certainly be counted amongst the Eleusinian in their strict and limited sense; for they were not, in fact, celebrated at Eleusis, but at a distance of four hours' (leagues) journey from thence, and an interval of six months elapsed between them and the Eleusinia. But they were the preparation for the latter. The sense of the myth of the two places was in keeping; and only those who had been already initiated at these Dionysia were allowed admittance at Eleusis. And now also one can see how it is Clement, in his representation of the substance of the mysteries, in which the distinction and logical consequence of the particular secret rite is certainly at first sight obscure, and has given rise to many misunderstandings, could mention first the rape of Coré, and then make the mysteries of Dionysos Zagreus follow immediately afterwards, which again gives him an opportunity of combining with them the closely connected Lemnian cultus, whereupon he turns back again to the Eleusinia and the searchings of Demeter. With the exception of the interpolated notice of the Lemnian Cabiric rite, the remainder forms together a complete description of the cycle of the Athenic-Eleusinian mysteries.

[1] Aristid. i. 417; Artemid. *Oneirocrit.* i. 8; Plut. *Quæst. Sympos.* ii. 2.
[2] Athen. xi. 496. [3] Procl. *Comm. in Tim.* p. 293; Hippol. *adv. Hær.* (?).

Accordingly, when Proclus[1] and Hermius make three divisions, — the mystical rite, the initiation, and epopteia (inspection), they must be understood as following the Eleusinian directions. But when Theo of Smyrna[2] speaks of five degrees of initiation, he is putting on two, which in reality did not exist; for he mentions (besides the purification, the tradition of the telete, and the epopteia) the initiation, or clothing of a hierophant or dadouchos, who, as one presumes at least, knew a great deal more of the mysteries than was communicated to others; an initiation accompanied by a kind of enthronisation, with swathing of the head in fillets, and setting a crown on it. Lastly, Theo adds, as the fifth degree, the sentiment of blessedness, as arising from the consciousness of being a favourite of the deity, and being called to the delights of the after life in common with the gods (in Hades).

The exclusion from the greater mysteries at Eleusis of all who had not been duly prepared and passed through the little ones, was so strictly kept to, that the warders of the temple there once had two Acarnanians put to death, only for having gone in with the crowd, by mistake, to the consecrated area.[3] But if purity was desired in those who were to be initiated, we are not to understand by the expression moral purity of soul, the idea of which, to the extent we are acquainted with it as an ordinance of religion, was quite strange to heathendom. If a man had touched a corpse, he was just as impure as if he had committed murder; and if one killed another, whether unintentionally or deliberately, the acts were equivalent here. Hence, too, hetairai were unhesitatingly admitted to the mysteries,[4] and the means of purification were entirely external and mechanical. They consisted in part of ablutions in salt and fresh water, and principally of fumigation with sulphur, and smearing with the blood of a sow in young. In Samothrace, it was the custom before initiation to inquire what crime of special enormity any one had committed; for a particular priest (Choës) was appointed there for the preliminary expiation of such crime, the guilt of blood for

[1] Proclus. *in Tim.* iv. 26. He calls the initiation μύησις.
[2] Theo. p. 21; Gelder, and his notes, p. 126.
[3] Liv. xxxi. 14. [4] *E.g.* those of Lysias. *Demosth. c. Neær.* 1352.

instance; but they are mistaken who have attempted of late to construe this into a formal confession. No such interrogation took place at the Eleusinia; every one, if not stained with the guilt of open and notorious murder, and still unreconciled, was allowed to consider himself as pure.

With this view of purity and defilement the inhibitions agree, which forbade the use of certain fruits and animals to the mystæ in Eleusis. Beans, for instance, were considered as impure, and therefore the Pheneat priests of the Eleusinian Demeter told how the goddess excepted beans when she made a present of other vegetables to her guests.[1] They abstained also from domestic fowls, some kinds of fish, and the pomegranate.[2] The reasons assigned in the mysteries for so doing were of a purely accidental character, as in the case of the pomegranate, the well-known myth of the consequences to Coré from eating it. A particular value was attached to the garment which people wore during the initiation; it was worn as long as possible, and pieces of it were even fastened about children as talismans.[3]

The hierophant, and only he, was bound to perpetual continence; and as, among the heathens generally, credit was not given to a man for the requisite moral strength and self-restraint, he was obliged to rub hemlock-juice into himself to deprive himself of generative power.[4] It was probably the relation to the Chthonic deities that made this continence or self-enervation appear necessary. The priest must conform himself to the deities whose rites he solemnised and whose minister he was. He was to present himself barren as Persephone, and sexless as Iacchos. Their titles in the rite show too what an idea people had of the peculiar sanctity of the hierophant, and of the other priests and priestesses assigned to the mysteries. They bore, in fact, holy names, which were to be kept secret; whilst the mention of their secular names was avoided even in official documents.[5] The account of Porphyry,[6] that the hierophant in his vestments represented the creator; the

[1] Pausan. viii. 15. [2] Porphyr. *de Abst.* iv. 16, p. 353, Rhoer.

[3] Aristoph. *Plut.* 840: comp. Schol. on the passage.

[4] Serv. *ad Æn.* vi. 661; Schol. *ad Pers. Sat.* v. 145; Hieron. *adv. Jov., Opp.* iv. 192; Epist. *ad Ageruch.* iv. 743: Hippol. *adv. Hær.* p. 115.

[5] Lucian, *Lexiph.* 10; Eunap. *Vita Soph.* p. 90.

[6] *Ap. Euseb. Præp. Evang.* iii. 12.

dadouchos the sun; the epibomius, Selene; and the hierocerux, Hermes, is a later and arbitrary interpretation, invented by the Neo-Pythagoreans.

The Attic mysteries were originally instituted only for the tribesmen on the spot, but as a general rule every one of these was initiated; many had received initiation in their boyhood; and in Athens it was an exceptional case for any one to keep his distance of the Eleusinia, and that the more, as he would have incurred the suspicion of being of an irreligious mind by so doing. The view, that after death divine honours (of mystic union with the Chthonic gods) would be shared by all the initiated, must have contributed extraordinarily to the throng of the Athenians to admission.[1] The other Hellenes were allowed entrance to the rite; and from an expression in the Platonic letters, we may infer that many friendships were founded in the bond which connected the foreigner with his Athenian mystagogue.

But even among the higher and wealthier classes, who could easily afford the expenses of the journey and of initiation, the number of the non-initiated was still doubtless much larger than that of the mystæ. Not that there were generally many who remained strangers to all mysteries; that such was not the case is shown by a trait in the timid man described by Theophrastus, who, on going aboard a ship, anxiously inquires first of each of his fellow-passengers if he has been initiated, implying that the presence of even a single uninitiated person on board might endanger the lives of all.[2] Thus, there were but few not initiated. But the great part of the Hellenes had their own mysteries at home, or had received their cultus of Demeter, like the Phliasians,[3] from Eleusis; or, as was the case in Messene, Athenians had gone to them and reformed their Demetric mysteries after the Attic canon, and made them more solemn.[4] We may safely conclude, from the assertion of the Cynic Diogenes, that no one, at least from the states which were habitually hostile towards Athens, would have taken the trouble to solicit for initiation at Eleusis; for when he was asked at Athens, in regard to the preference

[1] Schol. *Aristoph. Ran.* 158.
[2] Theoph. *Charact.* 25.
[3] Pausan. ii. 14. 2.
[4] *Ibid.* vii. 18.

given to the initiated in the lower world, to go and get himself initiated, Diogenes replied, it would be ridiculous that Agesilaus and Epaminondas should lie in the mire, while a notorious thief like Pataecion was in the enjoyment of bliss.[1] He evidently mentioned the two names only on the general presumption, that the one being a Spartan and the other a Theban, neither had been initiated. In fact, with the exception of those who belonged to Athens, the list of distinguished Greeks who are ascertained to have been initiated is very small. We are only acquainted with the names of Pythagoras, Philip of Macedon, Demetrius Poliorcetes, Philip the son of Demetrius, and Apollonius of Tyana; yet probably Pindar was, and undoubtedly Plutarch.

All barbarians were excluded. The Scythian Anacharsis must have been the only one who obtained initiation, and that not till the freedom of the city of Athens had been bestowed upon him.[2] Entrance, however, could not be denied to the victorious and dominant Romans; and once granted, it seems to have been soon extended to all the inhabitants of the Roman empire; for Cicero, in his time, makes mention of a verse, the import of which was the initiation of even the most distant people.[3] Notwithstanding, we know but few Romans who took advantage of the privilege; they are these—Sylla, Varro, Crassus, Atticus, and probably Cicero with him, then Octavian and Marcus Antoninus, and lastly Julian.

It seems striking that so faithful a secrecy should have been demanded about religious matters, to which children, women, and slaves were admitted (the latter perhaps exceptionally), but in reality the mysteries could only maintain their character and consideration by it; probably, too, an obligation under oath was imposed upon the mystæ to observe silence. At the same time, there is no need of forming a great idea of this obligation; for, in the first place, the seal was often broken,—as might be expected without fail, from the number and nature of the initiated,—so frequently broken that the language had a special word

[1] Plut. *de aud. Poet.* vi. 76, Reisk.; Diog. Laert. p. 201; Steph. *M.* vi. 39.

[2] Lucian, *Scyth.* 8. i. 868, Bip.

[3] *De Nat. Deor.* i. 42.

to express it;[1] and though the punishment of death was enacted against the violation at Athens, and though there generally a sin committed against the mysteries was considered as the most grievous of all breaches of religion,[2] yet the arm of Athenian justice did not reach beyond Attica, and in other parts of the Greek-speaking world such violations of secrecy mostly passed without punishment. Then besides, the silence enjoined was limited to the formulæ, the symbols exhibited, and the scenes represented,[3] while as to theological dogmas or opinions, revelations concerning nature, and histories of particular deities, which were left in the mysteries to the sentiment and inference of individuals, rather than made the subject of particular instruction, these, as might be expected, frequently found their way out of the circle of the initiated, and were used by others for their own purposes, as is shown in the case of the Greek tragedians, of whom Æschylus was not even initiated.

Some portions of the mysteries remained hidden, or at least ambiguous, even to the initiated. They saw with their eyes, it is true, the mythical occurrences represented, but knew not what interpretation they were meant to put upon them. Wide room was here left for the play of each person's imagination; for the symbolico-physical explanations which the conductors of the mysteries gave of particular usages and rites, especially of the more repulsive, were only vouchsafed to this or that highly favoured individual; and, as Philo of Byblus observes, were only invented at a late period.[4] Varro appealed to the observance of secrecy in the Grecian rites and mysteries in confirmation of his view, that much of the substance of religion was true, which it was not only inexpedient the people should know, but was also better that they should be deceived about.[5] The truth of the matter may perhaps be this, that the indiscriminate discussion of the mystery theology would have made the

[1] ἐξορχεῖσθαι, "to dance out," because a great part of the representations consisted of mimic dances and statuesque tableaux.

[2] Isocr. *Or. de Bigis*, *Opp.* III, 138, Auger.

[3] The ἱστορεῖν τὰ κατὰ μέρος τῆς τελετῆς, as Diodorus expresses it, iii. 61 and v. 49.

[4] Theodoret. *Therap. Opp.* vi. pt. ii. p. 722, Schulze; Philo, *ap. Euseb. Præpar. Evg.* i. 31.

[5] *Ap. Aug. Civ. D.* iv. 31.

opposition between it and the popular religious teaching, as presented in the poets, and as furnishing the basis of public worship, to be too strongly felt, and brought into too prominent notice. The Olympic cycle of divinities afforded no scope for suffering and dying gods. It was otherwise in Crete. There, where, to the indignation of many Hellenes, even the tomb of Zeus was exhibited, folk cared not a whit about the religious teaching of the rest of Hellas, and therefore saw no reason for a mysterious veiling of the divine traditions, particularly such as originated in the island.

As a general rule, the mysteries were greatly beloved by the Greeks, and the crowds attracted to them appear to have continued the same even to the later Roman period. Plutarch ranks them among the things most acceptable to mankind, with feasts, sacrificial banquets, and the orgies (the Bacchic solemnities).[1] Their attraction lay in their veil of secrecy, transparent though it was, in the variety of feelings brought into play by lively dramatic representations, in the rapid transition from anxiety and suspense to serenity and joy, in the combination of all arts and artistic enjoyments, of music and song, the mimic dance, the brilliant lighting-up and effective decoration. All this, it is true, begot delight but momentary, and impressions that soon passed away. Still a deeper power, and one that bore on the whole of life, was brought into play by the assurances of a happy future after death, only proffered by the mysteries, and most prominently so by the Attic ones; whereas the public worship of the gods, being only directed to what was on this side of the grave and to earthly interests, had nothing of the kind to vouchsafe. But on what were founded these confident representations of bliss held out to the Epoptæ, and how was this happiness represented to them?

It is an established fact, that in the mysteries no philosophico-theological doctrine concerning the immortality of the soul was anywhere propounded, that man did not wholly pass away after death and become lost in nothingness. That he lived on somehow or other, were it only in the melancholy state of shadow existence, was anyhow the

[1] Plut. *de Superst.* vi. 647, Reisk.

general idea ever since there was a Greek people. But that, after death, the condition of the initiated would be a different one, and much better, than that of the great bulk of mankind, and particularly of barbarians (though in truth the Egyptians too had their under-world mysteries), was always the grand benefit promised in the mysteries; this was the loadstone with the greatest power of attraction. The initiated delighted in the prospect of the special favour and protection of Persephone, the queen of Hades; by initiation they had entered into her special service, and so had a claim, as it were, upon her to be of her household there, and to partake of her goods and privileges. And as Dionysos was called back again to life by Demeter, when she put his limbs together, and cherished him in her bosom and infused a fresh divine and vital warmth into him, so might the servants of the goddess hope that they would be exempted, through her kindness, from the void and cheerless shadow existence of the rest of mankind, and be restored to a perfect life even of physical powers.

The imitation of what the Chthonic deities had once done, and sympathy with their sorrows and joys, rendered the mystæ well pleasing to those powers; and the further notion was attached to the celebration of the mysteries, that as they were owing to the institution of Demeter herself here, they would continue even in Hades to form the delightful employment of the initiated servants of the gods for ever.[1] A passage of Diodorus contains the strongest expression regarding this ever uttered by the ancients, and it looks all the stranger in him, Euhemerist as he is: "The gods vouchsafe through the teletai an eternal life, the perpetual employment of which consists in sweet devotion."[2] This, nevertheless, was an isolated notion, comparatively foreign to the prevalent Hellenic views, and going far beyond them. According to Plato, it was rather sensual pleasure and endless intoxication that was promised to the initiated.[3] These, in Aristophanes, sing, "To us alone shines the glad sunlight there." On the other hand,—and this is what is generally maintained,—the uninitiated would be all entangled in mud and gloom

[1] So Simon, *Socr.* p. 122, ed. Boeckh.

[2] *Exc. Vatic. in Maii Coll.* ii. 8.

[3] Plato, *Rep.* ii. p. 363.

in the nether world, and condemned to the labour of filling a pierced vessel with water by a sieve.[1]

If the question be asked now, did the mysteries generally exercise a salutary and dignifying influence on the Greeks? Plato, Plutarch, Dionysius, and others have already furnished us with the answer; other ancient testimonies are, however, to be found affirming that influence to have been such, or at least have been usually quoted as doing so. It was said of the Samothracian Cabiric mysteries, that "they who were initiated there were held to be righteous";[2] by which, in fact, it is only asserted that they were held to be purified from all guilt by means of the effectual atonement there made. But the expression of Diodorus goes further: "People say that the initiated there become more devout and righteous, and better in all respects than they were before."[3] Nevertheless, in regard to the Eleusinia, where one would have *primâ facie* expected it to be otherwise, there is no Greek testimony to be found of any importance. Only the Roman Juvenal seems to have considered the hierophant generally entertained the hope that the person to be initiated was good and pious.[4] It appears, too, that an admonition to the effect was administered on reception. But it cannot have been intended seriously; for out of the population of Athens, where each individual was intimately known, all were allowed indiscriminate admission,—the porter and the galley-rower, ay and the prostitute, as well as the eupatrid and philosopher. The passage of the orator Andocides, which has been frequently appealed to, will not bear the meaning that his judges, as initiated, had incurred a special obligation to be just, but only that, under the circumstances which involved the commission of an outrage at the mysteries, they were bound, as initiated, to punish the guilty and to acquit the innocent.[5] In Aristophanes,[6] the idea only is, there were two qualifications on which his fellow-citizens grounded their expectations of particular distinction in the world below,—initiation in the

[1] Plato, *Rep.* ii. 363; *Gorg.* p. 301 (?); Aristid. *Or.* 19, i. 421.
[2] Schol. *Aristoph. Pac.* 278.
[3] Diodor. v. 49.
[4] Juv. xv. 140.
[5] Andr. *Or. de Myst.* p. 94.
[6] *Ranæ*, 457: comp. the note of Spanheim to the passage.

mysteries, and kindness to strangers and citizens; it is by no means asserted that the latter quality was the effect of the former.

Initiation in the mysteries produced very different results according to the postulant's degree of education, the tone of his mind, and his preparation for it. The common people were delighted with the display of splendour and the changing of the scenes, and comforted themselves with the prospect of happiness secured to them in the lower world; while the philosophically educated and inquiring spirits were pursuing quite another train of thought, and not unfrequently drawing conclusions which, if generally adopted, must have led in their legitimate results to the dissolution of the popular and state religion. The Stoics and Hylozoists believed it to be an inference from the subject-matter of the mysteries, that the gods were nothing else but distinct parts of the material universe. The Peripatetics preferred understanding from the Eleusinia, that the Deity had laid the foundations and beginnings of all civilisation and humanity in agriculture. They of Euhemerist mind discovered in the entirely human adventures and acts of the mystery-gods, their sufferings and death, a corroboration of their view, that beings such as these had only attained to the actual enjoyment of divine glory by a kind of apotheosis. Finally the Neo-Pythagoreans, or later Platonists, bestirred themselves in support of the view, that the symbols and ceremonies of the mysteries were a veil for the dogmas of an ancient system of theology and philosophy derived from Egypt and Chaldea.

To give a physico-philosophical meaning to the Zagreus myth was particularly obvious. Zagreus is made out by Plutarch to be the same as the divine soul of the world, clothing itself in bodily shapes that were ever varying. In order to conceal the truth from the multitude, the metamorphoses of this god of nature into the winds and water, the earth and stars, and various species of plants and animals, were represented figuratively by the being lacerated and dismembered, and the being always allowed to be restored to life again in order to go through the same process afresh.[1] It was an amplification of a later

[1] Plut. *de. Ei. ap. Delph.* p. 389 (vii. 528, Reisk.).

period that the history of the soul of man was mystically and symbolically exhibited in the Zagreus legend, to wit, that the life of earth was a continued laceration, like that of Dionysos, to the soul bound up in the body and drawn into a vortex of sensitive affections, and it returned back to the unity of the divine substance by death.[1]

It has been asserted that the desire not to forfeit the purity of the initiation, and communion with the deity acquired by it, must have had a beneficial effect on people in producing attention to their moral behaviour. But it has never been either taught or believed that the initiated forfeited the advantages he had acquired in the mysteries by a transgression committed subsequently; had that been the case, he would have taken the benefit of a fresh initiation so soon as he feared to have lost the fruits of the former by his own sin. But this never happened. Once initiated, he remained so always; and the apprehension of frustrating the effects could arise the less frequently as the purifications in the mysteries were only necessary just for the moment of initiation, and were not considered standing remedies, like the Christian sacraments. If any one afterwards was inclined to ask again for similar media of expiation, he easily found a priest to perform the like ablutions, fumigations with brimstone, or rubbing-in of swine's blood, accompanied with equally powerful formulæ. Plato, speaking with unmistakable reference to the Eleusinia, decided quite differently; for he thought that this rite served only to strengthen and make a man secure in unrighteousness.[2]

THESMOPHORIA AND SABAZIA

The Thesmophoria also belong to the Attic mysteries in their wider signification; for they formed a secret service, similarly dedicated to Demeter. The goddess was there honoured with secret rites, as the giver of laws and the orderer of social and moral life, and specially as institutrix of the marriage bond. The opening of the soil, and the scattering of the seed on the tilled land, formed a symbolic

[1] Damasc. *Vit. Isid. ap. Phot. cod.* 242. 526.

[2] Plato, *Rep.* ii. 363.

allusion to the physical relation of husband and wife. The pregnancy and travail of wives were esteemed states sacred to Demeter. Women were obliged to abstain from their husbands several days before the solemnity, and to fast sitting on the ground. Then they assembled in a particular building where the Cteis (comb), a figure of the *pudenda muliebria*, was worshipped in due form.[1] In its reference to the separation and reunion of mother and daughter, this was a solemnity both of mourning and joy. A service of Themis must have been combined with that of Demeter in these Thesmophoria; for Themis was so nearly akin to Demeter, as goddess of earth, foundress of cities, and institutrix of the Dionysian mysteries, that it could not be ascertained satisfactorily whether the image in Thelpusa represented Demeter Erinys or Themis.[2] According to the Orphic teaching,[3] which on this point certainly agrees with the secret worship, Themis was only another name for Gé,[4] and Gé, again, was completely identical with Demeter. Æschylus had propounded the first view, Euripides the latter, from the Orphic theology, on the Athenian stage.[5] Hence Clement names, as secret symbols of the Themis mysteries, the bitter herb organy, the lamps, the sword, and the female cteis.[6] Now these were precisely the things which were exhibited and worshipped in the Thesmophoria.

Next to the acknowledged state mysteries, those which had been introduced from abroad kept their station as of private institution. Of these the most important and most frequented were the Sabazia, the myths of Zeus, Demeter, and Persephone forming the programme; Zeus overpowered Deo, and of her begot Persephone. To appease her indignation at the act, he cut off the testicles of a ram, and threw them into her lap as if they were his own. The mystical formula in relation thereto, "I have eaten out of the drum and drunk out of the cymbal, I have borne the sacrificial chargers and slipped into the thalamus

[1] Athen. 14. 56 (?); Theodoret, *Gr. Off. cur.* iii. p. 784, Schulze.
[2] Paus. viii. 25. 4.
[3] *Orph. Hymn.* 79 (78), v. 2.
[4] Γαίης τὸ βλάστημα νέον.
[5] Æsch. *Prom.* xviii. 209, 1090; Eurip. *Bacch.* 275.
[6] Clem. *Protrept.* p. 11.

(the bridal chamber)," had, as one gathers from the comment of Clemens, an impure meaning.[1] The representation followed of the incestuous cohabitation of Zeus, in the shape of a serpent, with his own daughter, and of their engendering Dionysos Sabazius, in reference to which a golden serpent was drawn through the bosoms of the mystæ. And there was a riddle that was explained in the mysteries: "The bull is the father of the serpent, and the serpent the father of the bull;" meaning that Zeus had forced Demeter under the appearance of a bull, and his son by Persephone was the bull Dionysos.[2] These things, however, must have been brought forward on the stage in a very undisguised and palpable manner, as Diodorus says, of the choice of night-time for the celebrating the Sabazia, that "the sense of shame accompanies the union of the sexes."[3]

To the class of private mysteries also certainly belonged those which Firmicus describes, in which an image was carried by night on a litter, and lamented over in a kind of measured plaint. A light was then brought, and the priest salved the throat of each of the mourners, whilst he muttered the words: "Be comforted, ye mystæ of the rescued god; for out of sorrow happiness will spring for you." The god, thus lamented as dead, and again restored to life, was Osiris, or Zagreus; and from the words of our informant, "Thou liberatest thy god, thou puttest together again the scattered members of the statue," we may infer that the laceration of the god was represented by the breaking of the image, and his restoration to life by putting the fragments together again.[4]

[1] Clem. *Protrept.* p. 14; cf. Firmic. p. 90, Oehler.
[2] Arnob. v. 20; Clem. *Protrept.* p. 14.
[3] Diod. iv. 4.
[4] Firmic. p. 100.

BOOK IV

I. PRIESTHOOD AND DIVINATION

THE priest class had no deposit of religious doctrine either to guard or to propound; for amongst the Greeks generally there was nothing taught about religion, and the legends of the gods were handed down from mouth to mouth, or by the universal reading or recitation of the works of the poets. Therefore their office consisted principally in the care of the sacrificial worship, supervision of the temple, and the administration of its property—the temenos. No sort of intellectual capacity whatever, or special education, or training beforehand, were required of the priest. It is highly characteristic that Plutarch, while specifying the various classes of persons from whom a knowledge of religious things might be gained, should make no mention of priests, though he does of poets, lawgivers, and philosophers:[1] quite in keeping with which, Dio Chrysostom[2] reckons as sources of religion, besides the universal sense of it which is common amongst men,—poets, lawgivers, sculptors and painters, and lastly philosophers too; and so it never occurred to him also that advice on religious matters could be obtained from priests. Therefore it is not to be wondered at that Plato should not have thought of requiring any single intellectual qualification from the priests of his ideal republic. An unblemished person, birth in lawful wedlock, descent from an irreproachable family, and freedom from grievous guilt were the only

[1] Plut. *Amator*, p. 469 (ix. 59, Reisk.; 40, Wyttenbach).
[2] *Or.* xii. pp. 391–397.

things to be regarded in their election, which was to be submitted to lot.[1] The Athenians made freedom from bodily defects the only condition in the choice of their sacrificial or King Archon, and hence the saying of Isocrates, that the priestly dignity belonged to all men.[2]

Nevertheless, access to the sacerdotal office was not so completely free and open to every one; for, on the one hand, there were many hereditary priesthoods, attached to particular families, within which the investiture took place, either by right of primogeniture or by lot. These hereditary offices occurred more frequently in the old parent states, much less so in colonies, as a priestly family was not easily induced to leave its domicile. Besides, strangers were never admitted to the sacerdotal dignity, not even when they had obtained the freedom of the city; and lastly, favour was shown in the election to distinguished birth; and even without that, in most cases poor people were excluded or deterred from canvassing by the expense attendant on the dignity.

In harmony with the genius of the Greek religion, beauty of form was the attribute which constituted a priest's chief recommendation. At Ægion, the most beautiful boy was selected to be priest of Zeus;[3] at Tanagra, the most beautiful young man for the service of Hermes. Often too virginity and continence were necessary for the administration of a divine rite. In such cases boys or maidens were chosen, who fulfilled the priestly duties only till the age of maturity, and were then replaced by others. A priesthood for life, with obligation to celibacy, occurred but seldom. Yet the fact is mentioned that the priestess at Gæa, in Achaia, was bound to live in perpetual continence; and further, the priestess of Heracles, at Thespiæ, as also the priestess of Aphrodite, to continue virgins.[4] If the same was required of men, as in the case of the hierophant at Eleusis, and, according to an assertion of Galen,[5] of the priests of Artemis and Athene, then, as the Greek had no faith in the enduring energy of a fixed religious purpose on this head, some physical precaution had to be resorted to.

[1] *Legg.* p. 759.
[2] *Ad Nicoch.* p. 19.
[3] Pausan. vii. 24. 2, ix. 22. 2.
[4] *Ibid.* vii. 25. 8.
[5] G. *ad. Epidem.* 3. i. 524.

Even in the shorter abstinences required by the ritual, people had recourse to a means of the kind. The imposition of these restrictions was carried to the furthest extent in the case of the priest and priestess of Artemis Hymnia, in Arcadia, who were obliged not only to perpetual continence, but also to live a life of entire isolation, being never allowed to enter a house.[1]

The sex of the priest did not invariably follow that of the god. Heracles and Poseidon had in some places, Dionysos almost universally, priestesses, while Artemis and Athene had male as well as female ministers; only boys could serve the last-mentioned goddess at Elatea. On the whole, however, the number of priestesses seems to have been in excess, for the female ministrants of a single deity frequently formed whole colleges, as at Athens the fourteen gerarai of Dionysos did. Nowhere in Greece did any important corporative organisation of priests or priestesses arise; the polytheistic division was an impediment. The priest of one deity had nothing in common with those of another, and thus they were deprived of the possibility of earning for themselves, as an exclusive order, a power or influence of deeper hold; and we do not find that even the priests of Zeus acquired any precedence over other divine ministers in right of the higher dignity of their god.

The priests had their share in the revenues of the temple property apportioned to them by law, or usage. Certain portions of the animals sacrificed, and their skins also, belonged to them. Besides, contributions were levied by itinerant priests, for the support of the service of the temple, and sometimes even an entrance fee imposed on its visitors.[2] The holy grounds, on which stood the temples, the sacred groves, and the dwellings for the priests and their servants, constituted the sacerdotal demesne, where they had control almost unlimited. Here and there the local repute of their god, or his sanctuary, swelled their revenues to great wealth; so that, for example, the priests at Olympia and Delphi could lend money at interest to whole republics.

If we were to make our calculations in these matters by

[1] Pausan. viii. 13. 1. [2] Tertull. *Apol.* 13; Plato, *Rep.* ii. p. 381 D.

Athens, taking her as a criterion, the number of priestly and other personages generally employed in religious occupations must have been uncommonly large. There was one priestess to ornament the chair of Athene, a "cataniptes," who had only to wash the peplos of the goddess on the occasion of the Panathenæa; and another priestess merely to look after her table. In Olympia, the business of keeping the statue of Zeus clean was intrusted to the descendant of the family of Phidias. In general, the custody, cleaning, and decoration of the temples and images of the gods employed many hands; there were temple-sweepers and door-keepers, with under-servants and slaves; then there were special functionaries, appointed by the state, under the title of Hieromnemones, or Epimeletai, partly to manage the sacred buildings and the temple funds, partly to provide for the arrangement of the solemnisation of the festival of the god, to select and purchase the beasts for sacrifices, and suchlike. This appointment of numerous special functionaries besides the priests must necessarily and designedly have subjected the latter to a strict supervision and to many restrictions.

A greater power and more independent position than the priesthood could bestow, hemmed in as it was by tolerably narrow bounds, was afforded by divination, to those who were intrusted with this important branch of religion; that is, whose avocation it was to investigate and publish the will of the gods, and to make known the future. Not unfrequently, indeed, priesthood and divination were united in one person, but the latter was oftener exercised as a particular calling, and in many different ways. In a religion resting upon the deification of nature, the whole of natural life must, in reality, have seemed to man a manifestation of the divine will through which the deity spoke, warning, animating, or discouraging him; but it was pre-eminently in the striking and uncommon phenomena, departing from the ordinary course of nature, that revelations of the divine will and of futurity were sought. Thus, divination was an art reposing on a tradition. In earlier times it was an inheritance in certain families of seers, some of whom,—the Iamids, for instance, of Olympia, and the Clytiads and Telliads of Elis,—were more widely spread

and greatly revered. After the decline of these families, about the period of the Persian wars, or later, individual soothsayers of note are everywhere to be met with, who were consulted in all more important undertakings. The Acarnanian seers, from whom Hesiod was said to have acquired the art of divination, were particularly famous.[1] Such seers, or interpreters of signs, accompanied armies to war, and, through the confidence which generals and their forces reposed in their counsels, exercised an influence frequently decisive, and sometimes injurious: witness the expedition of Athens against Sicily, which broke down in part because Nicias, acting on the advice of his diviner, would persist in remaining thrice nine days, because of an eclipse of the moon, in a military position which was untenable.[2] Hence the counsel of Xenophon, that the general should make himself acquainted with the interpretation of signs, in order to be able to keep a check upon the seer, and not to be open to deception by a false account of the signs.[3] Such soothsayers, who were resorted to for advice in all matters of grave consideration, were maintained at Athens, in the Prytaneum,[4] at the expense of the state; which, however, had a special officer of its own, whose duty it was to overlook them at the sacrifices.[5] Even in private affairs they were much run after, and their art was in high esteem. Many maintained a seer of their own at home, who was day by day obliged to inspect the entrails of the victims, or to interpret dreams.[6] People were eager to consult them, particularly in sickness, and in general every extraordinary sign that was thought to have been observed was submitted to them for interpretation.

The inspection of entrails, not mentioned in Homer, and probably a later arrival in Greece from the East, was an art practised upon established principles, which had to pronounce upon the colour and appearance of the inward parts, especially the liver and gall. It was the kind of divination at the same time in the greatest favour, and the

[1] Pausan. ix. 31. 4.
[2] Thucyd. vii. 50.
[3] *Cyrop.* i. 6. 2: cf. *Æn. Tact.* c. 10.
[4] Aristoph. *Pax*, 1084: cf. Schol. *ad h. l.*
[5] He was called the ἱεροποιός. Schol. *Demosth. Mid.* § 115.
[6] Plut. *Nic.* iv.

most resorted to on public occasions. The power and value of the sacrificial action depended so much upon it, that if the result of the extispicia was unfavourable, the whole operation was interrupted or adjourned.[1] The course of the sacrifice itself too, the behaviour of the victim, its cries, the figures which with some assistance from the imagination might be traced in the ashes of the animal when consumed,—all this presented copious matter for the knowledge of the future. One of the oldest forms of divination was soothsaying from the flight and song of birds, which Socrates himself recognised as one of the channels chosen by the gods for the revelation of their will.[2] By a careful observation of birds, it was formed into a science, which, however, never attained in Hellas to the great importance and influence on affairs of state that was conceded to it in Rome.

As, besides certain voices, which were held to be divine or demonic, people also attributed a presaging power to the appearances of the sky, lightning, and other heavenly signs, the Ephors in Sparta, every nine years, and the Pythäists in Athens before the departure of the Delian embassy, had first to take the aspect of the heavens;[3] this sort of soothsaying, however, was not really carried to any great extent amongst the Greeks.

Even astrology belonged only to the Roman period, and was mostly practised by foreigners, Chaldeans or Egyptians. It came, however, to be in greater requisition just as other kinds of soothsaying had already fallen into disuse or contempt.[4]

It often happened that the promises of victory held out by the soothsayer were fulfilled through the spirit and confidence they inspired their people with; yet Greek statesmen and generals made no scruple about inventing prodigies, such as they happened to be in need of; the soothsayers did this themselves still more often, or took good care that the portents corresponded with their intentions. They often obtained their end against the wills of the prince or commander. Thus, the augur Theodotus succeeded in interrupting a peace which king Pyrrhus intended to con-

[1] Thucyd. v. 54; Herodot. ix. 38.
[2] Xen. *Apolog. Socr.* i. 12, 13.
[3] Plut. *Agis.* 11; Steph. Byz. *s.v.* "Pytho."
[4] Orig. *ap. Eus. Prep.* vi. 11.

clude with Lysimachus.[1] Nevertheless, when the soothsayer Diopeithes wanted to exclude Agesilaus from the royal dignity, by employing against him an oracle, to the effect that the Spartans were to beware of limping royalty, his purpose was frustrated by the remonstrances of Lysander.[2] Where the interpretations of the diviners were too glaringly in contradiction to the wishes of the rulers or people, there was still a remedy. Other diviners were won over, who opposed favourable and encouraging prognostics to those which before were adverse. This took place particularly in the expedition of the Athenians against Sicily. Fruitless attempts were made by the diviners and others to dissuade the people from it, by the publication of terrifying portents and prodigies. Alcibiades had augurs and oracles devoted to him, and to these the Athenian people gave credit.[3] Where, however, there was no such counteracting influence, the diviners in that case were able to seduce the Greeks to acts which their habits rejected; thus the sacrifice of the Persian prisoners to Bacchus Omestes, the act of Themistocles, was owing to the advice of the soothsayer Euphrantides. Not but that there were cases where the same influence, exercised in an opposite direction, saved human life.[4] When Pelopidas was on the point of sacrificing a young maiden, in conformity with an interpretation of the augurs, a soothsayer, Theocritus, succeeded in persuading him that it was not a fair maiden, but a white mare, that was required for a sacrifice.[5]

II. THE ORACLES

The Greeks, of all heathen nations, experienced the keenest desire to investigate the future; and no other people has there ever been so inventive in the variety of means of, as it were, extorting their secrets from the higher powers. Thus then it has come to pass that the extent and character which the system of oracles acquired amongst them is a phenomenon unique in history. From the number of his

[1] Plut. *Pyrrh.* 6. [2] Xen. *Hell.* iii. 3. [3] Plut. *Nic.* xiii.
[4] Plut. *Themist.* xiii. [5] Plut. *Pelopid.* xxi.

gods, his notion of the limits of their power, and the capricious wilfulness of these beings, at one time so easily won, at another as readily irritated, his whole future seemed less secure, gloomier, and more lowering to the Greek, than was afterwards the case with people supported by Christian principles. Even the will of the gods in reference to his behaviour was, in countless instances, a veiled thing to him, and withdrawn from all moral calculation. He had no revealed doctrine, through which he might have been enabled to interpret that will. In proportion too as, with the more devout worshippers, the circle of known duties was narrower, and the sphere of the arbitrary was more extended, the uncertainty, the timid doubt, the actual dread of futurity, must have increased. Therefore, besides the other means of inquiring into this future and the will of the gods, oracular answers constituted the daily bread of a Greek's life. To this is to be added the nature of the religion, which, with its multitude of deities, sacrifices, and rites to be observed, gave frequent occasion to ritual complications, to doubts as to the proper form of this or that ceremony, and to apprehensions lest a deity might have been offended by a mistake in, or neglect of, his worship. On these points it was the deity alone who could supply the explanation in person, and dissipate the tormenting doubt.

Of all the oracles of antiquity, the Delphian ranked the first, on account of its reputation and the universally admitted trustworthiness of its responses. Delphi was the centre not merely of the Hellenic soil, but also of the whole earth, according to Greek notions. Not even the circumstance of its being reputed the sanctuary of the Doric race, and that the oracle had always favoured Sparta, its constitution and enterprises, and had contributed to its power and greatness, could injure the estimation of this mouthpiece of the god amongst the other Hellenic states. The oracle was possessed of the highest authority in matters of religion and national law for the entire of Hellas. The sending out of colonies, war and peace, and all kinds of state affairs, were here resolved upon; for Apollo, as poets sang,[1] was sent by Zeus to Delphi to proclaim law

[1] *Alcæi Fragm.* xvii. p. 23, Matthiæ.

and equity to the Hellenes. As the Greeks had no hallowed code of law, and no priesthood clad with a teaching authority, the Delphic oracle necessarily stepped into the position of a supreme religious court, whose decisions and ordinances, as given immediately by the god, were considered infallible. Hence Plato required that all the laws relating to worship should be received from Delphi; and that even the choice of expounders necessary for their interpretation should be made with the concurrence of the Pythia.[1] Hence, too, Xenophon brought to bear, for the vindication of Socrates, the fact that he had been guided throughout by the answers of the Pythia in the honouring of gods and heroes, that is, by the principle of demeaning oneself in these things according to the laws of one's own city.[2]

The Delphic oracle, therefore, decided about the building of temples, solemnities of the dead, and the direction of sacrifices and ceremonies in the minutest particulars. It determined whether Heracles was to be honoured as god or only hero,[3] and ordained the restoration of rites that had fallen into disuse, as well as the introduction of a new worship. Thus the Athenians learnt from the Delphian god that the water-serpent they had seen in the fight at Salamis was a hero, Cychreus by name, and that they were to erect a temple in his honour.[4] But many answers of the Delphic oracle were so framed that people took refuge in the oddest and most artificial interpretations, in order still to discover in them a meaning worthy of the deity. For instance, if the god recommended the altar at Delos to be doubled, he did not mean this literally, but thereby incited the Greeks to the study of mathematics; this at least was the interpretation with which Plutarch was content. The Pythia was also willing to afford information on private affairs; questions were asked about family matters, inheritances, and the celebration of forbidden marriages; and it is on this point the view of Socrates is remarkable. He approved, namely, of the oracle being consulted on such things as were out of the sphere of human foresight,—as

[1] Plat. *Legg.* vi. p. 759.
[2] *Memor.* i. 3. 1.
[3] Schol. *Pind. Nem.* iii. 38; Arrian, *Exp. Alex.* iv. cap. xi.
[4] Pausan. i. 36. 1.

concerning the result of building a house, or as to the cultivation of an estate, or the choice of a wife; but that it was foolish, and even impious, to have recourse to the deity about matters in which a man could judge for himself as well as the god.[1] Already, therefore, in his time, such questions were submitted to the oracle. Later on, in Plutarch's time, it was only these private affairs of individuals which they laid before Apollo for advice. Questions about political complications and interests had ceased in Hellas with the loss of her independence.

The Pythia, in earlier times a young maiden, in later a woman upwards of fifty, and generally of low origin and without education, though of unsullied moral character, prepared herself by chewing laurel leaves and by a draught from the holy fountain of Castaly; and then mounted on the tripod, placed over the chasm, so that she received the vapour which issued from it into her body.[2] Whence, as if pregnant of the god,[3] she fell into an ecstasy, during which, in violent agitation and with foaming mouth, she uttered incoherent words. So strong was the effect upon her, that in a case mentioned by Plutarch, when she was unwilling to ascend the tripod, as if seized by madness she was dashed shrieking on to the pavement, and died a few days after.[4] Her words were interpreted by the "Prophet," who was assisted by the five Hosii, or were reduced by them into the form of a regular oracular response, which, in earlier times, had to be put into verse; but by the time of Theopompus the prose form had become the more common, and in Plutarch's age it was but seldom that an oracle was issued in verse.

It is an unmistakable fact that the high priest or prophet, and the "holy" ones, had under their control the form in which the words were clothed that came out by jerks from, rather than were spoken by, the Pythia, and were often the first to give a meaning to that which was meaningless; yet that much also depended on the Pythia

[1] Xen. *Mem.* i. 1. 6–9.

[2] Orig. *adv. Cels.* vii. p. 125 (p. 333, Spencer); Chrysost. *Hom.* 20 *ad* 1 *Cor.* 22. tom. x. p. 260.

[3] Longin. c. 13 (p. 32, Weisk).

[4] Plut. *Orac. def.*, *Opp.* vii. 724, Reisk. (536, Wyttenbach).

herself is clear from the attempts at bribery, sometimes successful, and then punished with her dismissal. Nevertheless there was much that was inexplicable. On the whole, therefore, all believers in the Hellenic deities were usually convinced of the truthfulness of the oracle, its divine conduct and inspiration, or, in conformity with the rest of their opinions, assumed a predominance of demonic influences therein, as did Plato and Plutarch.[1] Moderns have thought to explain the problem on the hypothesis that for centuries the Delphian priests pursued a system of secret espionage, having in their pay a host of spies and informers in the most important places of the civilised world, through whom they were kept supplied, in the quiet of their cells, with the most exact news of all the changes that took place, of all that happened in reigning houses or noble families, their secrets, plans, and views, with all the questions which might be expected.[2] Here one enigmatical phenomenon is explained by another still more extraordinary, and which would stand alone in the whole of history. Such a net of espionage spread over the whole of the known world would have required a huge staff of blindly devoted instruments, with an expenditure to which not even all the treasure of Delphi itself would have been adequate. Nor could it have been kept secret for a permanence; for the opponents of the oracles, such as Œnomaus and others, would have been delighted to point this out, and Christian writers like Eusebius would have copied it from them. Still, it is true that, in the age of the greatness of Greece, Delphi possessed an extensive political influence through its oracles, so that it was the general belief that colonies founded without the approval of Delphi must come to a bad end; that the enmity of the priests there might be ruinous, as the example of the Crissæans proved; and that sacrificial offerings and gifts poured in

[1] Plato, *Conviv.* p. 202 E; Plut. *Orac. def.* vii. 642, Reisk. (480, Wytten.).

[2] So Götte (*Das Delphische Orakel*, 1839, p. 74). Hüllmann has struck out another way, not less mistaken (*Würdigung des Delphischen Orakels*, 1837): he declares all oracular responses to be apocryphal, or of a later invention, which, in his way of looking at them, contain anything inflated, far-fetched, figurative, and obscure, or involve sheer caprice, monstrous stupidity, or manifest contradiction, or which were said to have had a surprising fulfilment (p. 178). Thus out of twenty oracles he hardly gets one genuine response.

there to an immense amount. Lucian makes one of the Delphian priests say, "The sanctuary, the Pythian god, the oracle, those are our cornfields, our revenues, and riches. We sow not, and we plough not, and yet the god provides for us."

The numerous denunciatory blows aimed at whole cities, or responses proclaiming disaster, were almost always clad in a dark symbolical garb, leaving room for contradictory interpretations; and if many oracles ambiguous in their tenor were invented and fathered upon the Delphic god, this took place precisely because deception was so easy, and because such double-meaning answers were in fact frequently given. So long as the credulous tone of mind prevailed in the nation, Greek wit and sagacity was always sure afterwards to devise an interpretation, which placed the truthfulness of the oracle beyond suspicion; as, for example, when the Pythia promised the Athenians that they should take all the Syracusans prisoners, it happened that only a muster-roll of the Syracusan army fell into their hands, and that nevertheless was enough to fulfil the oracle.[1] The Phocæans were just as good-natured; when their emigration to Corsica, undertaken with the advice of the oracle, proved unfortunate, they did not lay the guilt of the deception on the god, but took the burden of it on themselves, as having mistaken the name of the hero Cyrnos for that of the island.[2] The Pythia herself often treated the matter lightly, as when she counselled Erginus, when he wished to know how he might come by children, to marry a young wife; or when she promised victory to the Spartans in a war, on condition they conducted it with all their might. Whatever might be the issue of the war, the oracle remained intact.

Hellenic Asia Minor had three celebrated oracles of Apollo: that of Branchidæ at Didyma, near Miletus, where the priestess stepped barefoot into a spring resembling the Castalian, and caught into herself the vapour as it ascended from the water;[3] a second at Claros, near Colophon, where the soothsaying prophet drank of a hidden water spring; and a third at Patara in Lycia, where the priestess was shut

[1] Plut. *Nic.* xiii. 14.
[2] Herod. i. 165–167.
[3] Jamblich. *de Myster.* p. 74.

up at night in the temple, and received communications from the god.[1]

The oracles, not Apollo's, were generally mere oracles by signs. The most esteemed of these were the shrines of Zeus at Dodona, and that of Ammon in Libya. The first had a speaking oak, which afforded prophetical revelations by the rustling of its leaves and the notes of birds that nestled in its branches, united to the murmur of a spring gurgling up at its foot, and the clang of brazen basins. For that was required, however, interpretation by the priestesses of the place, the Peleiades, two or three aged women, who, like the Pythia at Delphi, first threw themselves into an ecstatic state[2] (what means they employed is not known), and then fashioned the sounds they heard into oracular responses. In the primeval period of Greece, this oracle of Zeus was the most important of all, and consulted in all undertakings of a graver nature. Lysander made a failure in attempting to bribe it. The devastation of the holy places by some predatory Ætolian band about the year 220 B.C. seems not indeed to have destroyed the oracle, but to have considerably reduced its employment. It was deserted in Strabo's time, but revived again afterwards.

It is a very peculiar phenomenon that an oracle belonging to barbarians, and one so strange and distant as that of the Libyan Ammon, should have risen to great repute with the Greeks, and have been much consulted by them. The Greeks were made acquainted with it by the people of Cyrene, and the Eleans claim to have been the first to send messengers thither. The soothsaying was performed by a prophet, who derived the materials for his answers from the movements of the image of the god as it was borne by the priests.[3] An arrangement like this was indeed well adapted to correspond to the wishes of the richer and more influential inquirers; and full readily did it afford even to the Macedonian conqueror the coveted assurance that he was really god, and that the sovereignty of the earth was his destiny.

[1] Herodot. i. 182.

[2] Aristid. ii. 13; Philostr. *Imag.* ii. 33 (34?), p. 103; Plat. *Phædr.* p. 36.

[3] Diod. xvii. 50, 51; Strabo, 329–814 (1153, Oxf.).

In Olympia the Iamids divined from the tokens given by the flames that consumed the sacrifices. The oracle of Demeter at Patræ indicated by a mirror dipped in the spring of the shrine if a sick person was to die or get well.[1] Of the heroic oracles, the cave of Trophonius at Lebadæa in Bœotia was the most renowned, though the one which lay under the strongest suspicions of being managed by the impositions and trickery of the priesthood for the deception of the wealthy and the powerful. The many and long preparations, with numerous sacrifices, anointings, and ablutions, the drinking of the well there, the swathing in several bandages, the way in which people were drawn down into the adytum, all appear to have been distinctly calculated to throw them into a state of exaltation and stupefaction, in which, whilst underneath in a cave provided with many chambers and outlets, they saw sights and heard sounds which still had to be interpreted by the priests.[2] Frequently these manifestations had reference to the state after death, and the impressions were so terrific, that it was affirmed by those who had been in the cave that they never laughed again.[3] Notwithstanding the ridicule of the Attic comic poets, and a work written on purpose by Dicæarchus, known as an opponent of the oracle, the belief in its powers was maintained till the decline of heathendom.

The influence of the magnetic state on the oracular system is most clearly shown in the oracles by dreams, such as the shrines of Æsculapius at Epidaurus on the island of Cos, at Tricca and Pergamum, which afforded cure for sickness by means of incubation, or sleep in the temple, and the medicines suggested in dreams. The patients were prepared by fasting, baths, friction, sacrificial rites and blessings, and then thrown into a state of tension, or excitement, laid themselves down in the temple or its vicinity, upon the skin of a ram that had been sacrificed, and went to sleep in the confident expectation of being vouchsafed a communication from the god. They then

[1] Paus. vii. 21. 12.

[2] *Ibid.* ix. 39. 40; Max. Tyr. xxvi.; Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* viii. 19; Schol. *Aristoph. Nub.* 508: comp. Van Dale, *de Orac. Gent.* p. 192 sqq. A plate (p. 195) explains the tricks the priests resorted to, according to his ideas.

[3] Athen. xiv. 2. 614; Zenob. iii. 51.

dreamt, and, for the most part, of very simple remedies, which had been exhibited to them either in their natural form or in symbols and pictures; and where it was needful the interpretation of the priests assisted the comprehension. The description which the rhetorician Aristides gives of the state into which he was thrown by incubation is a proof of its being near of kin to somnambulism. He says, "I thought I was actually touching the god, and as if I felt his approach. I was between sleeping and waking; my spirit was quite light, so that it were impossible for one not initiated to express or understand it."[1]

The oracles of the dead, as existing in certain temples of the dead, or Psychomanteia, and served by priests who conjured up the dead, are, with a high degree of probability, supposed to have come into Greece from the East, being mentioned in the Old Testament[2] as a Phenician and Canaanitish abomination. This science was practised in Thesprotia on the river Acheron, and at Heraclea on the Propontis; and it was believed that the dead were compelled by the adjurations to appear and give answer.[3] Yet the institution seems to have fallen into decay again in Greece towards the time of the Peloponnesian war; perhaps because the oracle of Apollo by word of mouth met the exigency better, and this violent disturbance of the repose of the dead might have seemed to Greek feelings to be bordering too closely on impiety; for when the Lacedæmonians wanted to "lay" the manes of Pausanias, whom they had put to death, they had to send for the requisite psychagogues or necromancers from Italy.[4] For there, on the lake of Aornos, was a cavern where necromancers, after one sacrifice offered, called up before the inquirer a dim, indistinct outline, the soul of father or friend, who then and there made answer to the questions proposed.[5]

Many oracular places enjoyed only an ephemeral or transitory existence, and disappeared again, either because the fame and resort they first acquired could not be

[1] Aristid. i. pp. 63 sqq., 445 sqq.: cf. Jambl. *Myst.* iii. 3; Strabo, p. 775 (?); Aristoph. *Plut.* 622 sqq.

[2] Deut. xviii. 10, 11; Levit. xx. 27; 1 Sam. xxviii. 7; Isa. viii. 19.

[3] Herodot. v. 92; Plut. *Cim.* 6.

[4] Plut. *Ser. Num. Vind.* p. 560, viii. 220.

[5] Max. Tyr. xxvi,

maintained in the face of frequent deceptions, or the competition of other similar institutions, or because the physical condition of the spot to which the oracle was owing underwent change, such as the drying up of the mineral spring. Even in the case of Delphi, Cicero, or his brother Quintus, introduced by him as speaking, attributed its decline to the earthly influence, by which the Pythia used to be inspired, having probably lost its strength.[1] In many cases the general abatement of the inclination to believe, connected with the increasing depopulation of Greece since the Macedonian period, sufficed to bring about their decline. In Cicero and Strabo's times, according to the assertions of both, the depreciation of oracles, even the Delphian, must have been tolerably general,[2] though their reputation did revive afterwards. This falling or rising was necessarily regulated by the state of religious feeling in general, for many of the questions put related only to particulars of worship. The oracles ordered the bones of one who had died abroad to be brought back home, or prescribed a religious ceremony, the erection of images, or the offering a sacrifice; or they associated the welfare of a state with the preservation of some old consecrated object.[3] But with the increasing coldness towards the gods, and the gradual march of unbelief, these occasions for the activity of oracles ceased.

How far confidence in the oracles was undermined by the failure of their predictions can no longer be exactly estimated. Willing belief could still fall back upon many that were actually fulfilled; for, as Aristotle remarks of the interpretation of dreams, he who shoots often must sometimes hit;[4] and what Diodorus said of the prophesyings of a certain Syrian holds equally of oracles,—"Of those things which did not come to pass no mention was made, while on the contrary there was a great stir about those which were fulfilled." And how easy would the fulfilment be if the applicants were all as credulous, and had their minds as much resolved beforehand to put the best colour on all that

[1] Cic. *de Divin.* i. 19.
[2] *Ibid.* ii. 57; Strabo, p. 419 (607, Oxf.).
[3] Pausan. iv. 20. 2; Theophr. *Hist. Plant.* v. 3.
[4] Aristot. *de Div. per Somn.* i. 539 D.

was said, as Aristides the rhetorician! The oracle had made known to him that the god and the white maidens would take care of him. Shortly afterwards he received an imperial despatch, which extricated him from a difficult position he was in, and then it was clear as day to him that the oracle by the white maidens meant the letters.[1]

Uncertainty also must have arisen often from the number of oracles consulted, and the discrepancies in their replies. Thus, on occasion of the war against Sparta, people in Thebes had oracles for and against it, just as happened before in Athens with the Sicilian venture. So Epaminondas had the favourable responses placed on the right of the tribune, and the unfavourable on the left, and challenged his fellow-citizens to make up their minds one way or other, according as they were courageous or faint-hearted.[2] It also happened that the signs in the animals sacrificed contradicted the oracles, as in the expedition of Agesipolis against Argolis,[3] but in that case the signs, and not the oracles, turned the scale. Statesmen and generals, however, had no hesitation about inventing, on occasions, oracular responses adapted to the exigencies of the moment, as the examples of Alcibiades, Ducetius, and others prove.[4] The readiness of the oracles, even the Delphian, to acknowledge Alexander's claims to divine honours, and actually to adjudge the same to his friend Hephæstion,[5] may have opened the eyes of many, and given an impulse to contempt of these institutions, which continued to increase from that day forward.

Heraclitus said of the Delphian god, "he neither speaks out nor conceals, but indicates."[6] These indications were, however, generally so dim and enigmatical in the answer, that three, four, sometimes as many as ten different interpretations of the same response were conceivable; and by reason of the painful uncertainty about the right one, the plight of the applicant was often worse after he had his answer than before. Therefore, there were persons who

[1] Aristid. *Or.* xxvi. 1. 524.
[2] Plut. *Apophthegm. Reg.* vi. 728, 729 (p. 536, Wyttenb.).
[3] Xen. *Hell.* iv. 7.
[4] Plut. *Alcib.* 14; Diod. xii. 8. 29.
[5] Justin. xi. 11; Plut. *Alex.* 27; Diod. xvii. 115.
[6] *Ap. Plut. de Pyth. Orac.* c. 21, οὔτε λέγει, οὔτε κρύπτει, ἀλλὰ σημαίνει.

made a calling of explaining ambiguous or unintelligible oracles. They were called "Chresmologoi," a name, however, which did not merely mean such as interpreted the answers of the Delphian or other oracles, but those also who dealt in soothsaying on their own account. In earlier times, such Chresmologoi belonged to certain sacerdotal families, in which the art was hereditary; for instance, the family of the Melampodes, descendants of the famous Melampus.[1] Later, the Bœotian Bacis, who, inspired by the nymphs of the Corycian cave, had predicted the Persian expedition against Hellas, acquired a great renown; so that his name, to draw an inference from the use Aristophanes made of it,[2] became a kind of collective designation of the class of men. Other Chresmologoi, like Stilbides and Hierocles,[3] who are likewise ridiculed by Aristophanes, occupied themselves principally with the older oracular sayings which were still surviving in the mouths of the people, and in their application to the present time, or the almost immediate future. Thus, from the great number of oracles[4] and Chresmologoi, the mass of oracular sayings thrown into circulation was so varied and numerous, that a man could not easily be at a loss to have at hand an oracle with a suitable meaning, when required, for any given case or any end he pleased.

III. RELIGIOUS PURIFICATIONS

Before approaching matters of divine worship and celebration of rites among the Greeks, their sacrifices, prayers, and festivals, we must mention their purifications, as they necessarily preceded each act directed towards the deity. As far as the case admits of investigation, the idea of these ablutions and lustrations was a merely mechanical one. Priests and people had no aim or desire beyond the removal of a defilement, not considered as a moral, but a

[1] Herod. ii. 49. [2] A. *Pax*. 1052–54, 1102; *Aves*, 963; *Equit*. 123.
[3] Schol. *ad Aristoph. Pax*, 1029, 1041.
[4] Particularly in the Peloponnesian war. Thuc. ii. 8. 21, viii. 1: cf. Aristoph. *Aves*, 709–25, 959–91.

physical stain; and they attributed a magical operation to propitiatory rites through which they thought to attain that removal, which effect was certain to follow if there were only no omission in the rite, and that notwithstanding the will remained meanwhile consciously inclined to evil. In the historical period, therefore, the bodily ablutions and fumigations undergone were by no means a type to the conscience of a Greek of interior purification; and if Plato says, "It is only befitting the pure soul of the virtuous man to honour the gods with sacrifice, who receive no offerings from a polluted one,"[1] it is an idea worthy of him, but is nevertheless the idea of a philosopher who in many points saw far beyond his age and his people. The inscription also on the temple at Epidaurus, which placed the purity requisite for the approach to the shrine in holiness of disposition,[2] is too isolated, and rests on too recent evidence, to pass muster as the expression of the prevailing mode of thinking.

Accordingly, at the entrances to the temples there stood vessels containing water for sprinkling, which they were accustomed to bless by taking a lighted brand from the altar and dipping it in. The aspersion was made partly by the worshipper in person, partly by a priest, through the medium of a branch of laurel dipped in the water.[3] Corpses and women with child were reckoned especially impure. Hence whoever touched, or even only found himself in the vicinity of a dead body or lying-in woman, could not visit a temple or undertake any sacred duty without a previous purification.[4] Vessels of water on purpose for these aspersions were set at the doors of houses where there happened to be a dead body;[5] and after a funeral, those who had taken part had still a particular lustration to undergo. When the Athenians purified the island of Delos, all the coffins and graves upon it had to be

[1] Plat. *Legg.* iv. p. 716 D.

[2] Porphyr. *Abstin.* ii. 19. The passage of Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. p. 531, quoted by C. F. Hermann (*Gottesdienstl. Alterth. der Griechen*, p. 103, n. 20), also gives an explanation of the later philosophers, supported only by that inscription.

[3] Hippocr. *Morb. Sacr.* c. 2; Poll. *Onom.* i. 8; Lys. *adv. Andoc.* 255; Athen. ix. 409; Aristoph. *Pax*, 957.

[4] Eurip. *Iphig. Taur.* 380.

[5] Poll. viii. 7.

removed in conformity with this notion.[1] As to the pollution which the killing a man caused, it made no difference whether the action was a criminal one or quite innocent and unintentional. Purification from the guilt of blood was frequently effected by simple ablution; but there were also special priests for the purpose, as the Choës in Samothrace, and the so-called Psychagogues at the Arcadian Phigalia;[2] and these of course made use of a more artificial ceremonial. Sometimes the purification of a whole city or people seemed to be requisite, as for Athens, after the massacre of Cylon;[3] and Argos too, after the bloody vengeance executed on the mercenaries of Bryas.[4] At Athens, indeed, on occasion of any popular assembly, it was usual to sprinkle the benches on which the citizens took their seats with the blood of swine that had been sacrificed.

Superstition had here an immeasurable field before it The system of purification furnished a lucrative trade for many, and hence the vast number of different methods was being perpetually swelled by new inventions. Most commonly people availed themselves of sea-water ablutions, considered particularly effective on account of the salt contained in it. They not only washed themselves with it frequently, but the vessels also before they used them for sacrifice or libation; and Penelope washed even her clothes and then put them on again before she only addressed her prayer to the gods.[5] There were stories of men approaching the altar of Zeus with unwashed hands who had been killed by lightning. Then there were also purifications in which the hand was smeared with swine's blood from the sacrifice, or in which a man trod with the left foot on the skin of a ram that had been sacrificed to Zeus;[6] or they were smeared with earth, or had a young dog led round them;[7] sulphur also, squills, and eggs, did good service in this line. It was the custom to bury the instruments of purification afterwards, or to throw them into the sea.

[1] Thuc. iii. 104. [2] Pausan. iii. 17. 8.
[3] Diog. Laert. i. 110. [4] Pausan. ii. 20. 1. [5] *Odyss.* iv. 759.
[6] Athen. ix. 78; Hesych. i. p. 1005. [7] Plut. *Quæst. Rom.* 68.

IV. PRAYERS

As the whole life of the Greeks was penetrated with religion, and each and everything that concerned state or individual was thrown into relation with the gods, and as all contact of man with nature was in like manner converted into intercourse with them, so was prayer also woven into their whole public and private existence. Of course, a Greek could not associate with his prayers that signification which prayer has to a Christian, as an ascetic practice and means of obtaining moral purity and holiness. As a rule, they consisted only of short formulæ, which were easily transmitted among the priests; and, so far as the gods of the Greeks retained their ancient character of powers of nature, people attached to certain of these formulæ a compulsory power, binding their gods, and infallibly securing a hearing to their requests, a common feature of paganism. This, however, was more generally the case with the Romans than the Greeks, amongst whom the gods had developed more, through anthropomorphism into free personal powers. Hence the Greeks scarcely used to apply particular media and forms of adjuration to Zeus, Apollo, and the Olympic deities generally, but they did so to the gods of the lower world through the Orphic rites; and thus they employed, beside Homeric and Orphic apothegms, sundry plants, birds, bones of animals, and stones; and the result expected was healing of the sick, destruction of an enemy, atonement for their own sins, and the redemption of the dead.[1]

Of the deities, it was specially Zeus, Athene, and Apollo who were combined in one formula of supplication:[2] but it was natural that, in each state, the divinities who were particularly distinguished on the spot should be most invoked, and that men should adapt themselves to the nature of the emergency, which had its proper patron god. If, as Plato assures us, barbarian and Greek were everywhere accustomed to kneel and pray at the rising and set-

[1] Plat. *Rep.* 366; *Legg.* x. 909; Dioscorid. v. 113; Athen. xii. 553.

[2] Hom. *Il.* iv. 288, and in many passages in the *Odyssey*; Demosth. *in Mid.* 98; Max. Tyr. xi. 8.

ting of the sun and moon;[1] and if, as the same philosopher asserts, all who had but any sense appealed to the deity on every occasion in great and little matters,[2] so much so that even meal-times were concluded with either a prayer or hymn,[3]—then it follows that the Greeks, on the whole, were a people that were very diligent in prayer. The question no doubt is, "What was the substance of these prayers?" and on this head Bayle's assertion that Greek or Roman never asked of the gods for virtue or other moral qualities, but only victory, health, long life, and the goods of fortune, has been severely censured by modern authors,[4] and yet his view was already clearly expressed even by the ancients; Cicero makes his academician say, "Herein, indeed, are all agreed, that they have received external advantages,—vineyards, cornfields, olive-gardens, blessings on fruit of tree and field, and, in fine, all the comforts and conveniences of life,— at the hands of the gods, but no one ever has acknowledged virtue as a gift of the deity, and returned thanks for it as such. Now people style Jupiter 'best' and 'greatest,' not because he makes us just, temperate, and wise, but because he gives us health, security, and riches, and furnishes us abundantly with everything."[5]

Supposing now, on the strength of such statements, certainly borne out by many facts, that this was the common view of Greeks and Romans of Cicero's age, we still have on the other side to consider that, already, according to the Homeric view, the understanding and will of man were subject to the influences of the gods, and that it was they who infatuated and blinded him, or inspired him with good thoughts.[6] Later on we have three contemporary poets,—Simonides, Pindar, and Æschylus, the two last certainly, the former also probably, under Pythagorean influence,—all pointing to virtue and wisdom as gifts of the gods, or at least as a good only to be obtained through

[1] *Legg.* x. p. 887. [2] *Tim.* p. 27 c.

[3] Xen. *Symp.* ii. 1; Athen. v. 214 (?), ix. 408.

[4] Creuzer's *Symbolik*, 3rd ed. iv. 629; Lasaulx, "Prayers of the Greeks and Romans," in his *Studien des Class. Alterth.* 1854, pp. 140 sqq.; Schömann, in *Vindic. Jovis Æschylei*, Gryphisw. 1846, pp. 13, 14.

[5] Cic. *Nat. Deor.* iii. 36.

[6] See the passages in Nägelsbach, *Homer. Theologie*, pp. 14 sqq.

their aid.[1] Much later still the Alexandrine poet Callimachus calls on Zeus in his hymn to bestow virtue and riches. It is well known that Socrates prayed the gods to vouchsafe him interior and moral beauty: and no less was to be expected from him. Yet even his great disciple Plato states, on the contrary, "if any man obtain more or less virtue, that depends on himself alone, and not on the deity."[2] If, lastly, we consider that the Christian idea of grace was unknown to the heathen world, and that sacrifice, without which prayer was scarcely considered efficacious, was ever and only offered (so far at least as we can infer from the evidence) to obtain external and material goods, we shall then see in those expressions of a few poets but glimpses of light sprung from the schools of philosophy, and which had no significance in the minds of people in general. On this point the strongest evidence would be the prayer of the Lacedæmonians, who prayed the gods to their gift of good things to add that of the beautiful also;[3] but it is a question whether anything else was thereby asked than power, fame, and influence for the Spartan commonwealth, besides the daily requisites of life.

The Greeks, rejecting the habit of kneeling as barbarian and superstitious, were accustomed to pray standing, in a loud voice, and with hands held up to heaven. If the prayer was addressed to the gods of the lower world, they stamped with their feet on the earth, or struck it with their hands.[4] In order that prayer might be complete, it was customary to throw kisses from the hand to the gods, and this with the poor appears to have supplied the place of sacrifice.[5] Great stress was laid upon addressing them by their proper titles, and such as would be particularly acceptable to them. As these were often uncertain, if a man wished to express himself circumspectly he would add, "Be this or other name more grateful to thee."[6] Or the names

[1] Simon. *Fr.* p. 16. 45; Schneidew. *Pind. Isthm.* iii. 6; *Olym.* ix. 30; Æsch. *Agam.* 927.

[2] Plato, *Rep.* x. 617 c.

[3] Plut. *Lac. Inst.* vi. 888, Reisk. (p. 669, Wytten.).

[4] Cic. *Tusc.* ii. 25. 60; *Iliad*, ix. 568.

[5] Luc. *de Salt.* 17; *de Sacrif.* 12: cf. Apul. *Met.* iv. p. 155, Elm.; Tro. 83, Oudendorp.

[6] Plat. *Cratyl.* p. 400: cf. Æsch. *Agam.* 168.

and surnames of the deity were accumulated to the utmost; so that the hymns, as we see from the Orphici, often contained scarcely anything else than such accumulation of titles borrowed from the locality of the worship, or the qualities of the god. Often too the formulæ of prayer were kept secret, in order that others might not forestall the favour of the god. Homer accordingly in his early time makes Ajax admonish the Achæans to pray to Zeus in silence, so that the Trojans might not overhear, for one party might easily overbid the other by the promise of more abundant sacrifices and honours.

Like the adherents of all natural religion, where fear has much more weight than confidence and love, the Greeks also had a far stronger belief in the efficacy of curses and imprecations than in the power of blessings; and accordingly they had much more frequent recourse to the former than the latter. The custom of parents blessing their children before death, the Greeks do not seem to have known, though Plato tries to show that a prayer offered by a father or mother for the welfare of their child must be of a particularly beneficial power.[1] On the other, there was but one consentient voice in all antiquity as to a curse pronounced by parents on ungrateful, wicked sons being inevitably fulfilled in the most fearful manner.[2] Though even political laws were not unfrequently armed with appended imprecations upon their transgressors, yet it was the holy places, and the mysteries especially, for whose protection the whole machinery of solemn anathemas was employed. Alcibiades, accused of the sin of profanation of the Eleusinia, was publicly anathematised by all priests and priestesses in Athens, who, with their faces towards the west, waved crimson cloths while so doing.[3] Here too, somewhat later, before every assembly a curse was pronounced against all who should propose peace with the Persians.[4] Hence also a self-imprecation directed against perjury was not unusually added to solemn oaths.

[1] *Legg.* xi. p. 931.

[2] See Lasaulx's vouchers in support. "The Curse among Greeks and Romans," *Studien*, pp. 164 sqq.

[3] Lys. *adv. Andoc.* 51 (52 Oxf.).

[4] Isocr. *Paneg.* 156, 157.

V. THE SACRIFICES

Of all the means of manifesting religious sentiments, the rite of sacrifice is the most important and most significant: even amongst the Greeks, too, it formed the central point of their whole religious system. Priesthood, altars, and temples came into being originally, and next in order of time, for the sake of the sacrifices; and these acts of religion, extending back far beyond all history to the very first commencement of the Hellenic national life, constitute an inheritance which remained over to the Greeks out of that primal state antecedent to the division of nations, and from their Asiatic domicile, much as may have been disfigured and obscured therein by the course of time. As with other people, so with the Greeks, sacrifices were not offered of the free and common gifts of nature. It was not the mere spontaneous production of nature that was fit for offering, but whatever man appropriated by labour and care, and had thus translated into his domain.

According to the view of early antiquity, blood is the seat of the soul and of life, and hence especially acceptable to the deity as the highest and best of natural things, the prime and bloom of the whole animal world, and suited to be offered to him as a gift and a token of gratitude for benefits received. But, again, the blood, from its close connection with human passions, was also considered the root and seat of sins, which were therefore to be expiated by it, and their guilt and stain washed away. It was a grace of the deity if he admitted the substitution of strange blood for one's own. This was the meaning of the sacrifice of beasts, which, even when consecrated as an holocaust, without a portion being reserved for the offerer, he used to kill with the knife; or if they were struck down with a club,[1] it was still the custom for him to cut their throats to preserve the blood, and enable him to offer it to the deity by pouring it round the altar, or wetting the altar with it.

It was principally brute animals which were used for such substitution, and such of them, too, as were nearest in

[1] *Odyss.* xiv. 425; Dionys. Halic. vii. 72.

relation to and intercourse with man, and at the same time had a real value in his eyes. Thus the one most essential part of the sacrifice consisted in the catching and pouring out of the blood of the victim. The burning on the altar of certain portions of the victim previously reserved for the deity, which then followed, was no longer properly a part of the act of sacrifice, but belonged to the communion which followed upon it. As a token of atonement, and to knit closer the bond of union, men would sit at table with the deity; and what was consumed by fire was the portion allotted to the god from the repast, the remainder being made over by him to the guests for their consumption. The myth of the trick which Prometheus attempted to play off upon Zeus in the apportioning of the victim, by making him choose the bones, which had been enveloped in fat, is clearly an invention to explain a rite that had already become enigmatical to the Greeks themselves. For after the sterner and deeper signification of the blood-offering had been obscured by the real sting of sin being hid from them, and the feeling of their own sinfulness and continuance in a state of guilt towards the deity waxed feeble, then would the custom of consecrating to him in the fire what was unserviceable appear to them as a contempt of him; and that was what was expressed in this myth.

Nevertheless, the fact that human sacrifice, excessively frequent and ordinary as it was in the earliest times, was maintained here and there up to the latest times, indicates a view of the meaning of sacrifice which in the historical period had already in great measure disappeared from the conscience of the Greeks. According to the ideas of substitution, which form the groundwork of sacrifice, the blood or the life of an individual member of a race or people must have seemed the noblest or worthiest sacrifice where the guilt of a whole nation was to be expiated; and where the blood of animals appeared to panic-struck man as worthless and insufficient, then he would put his trust in the offering of a human life, particularly if the victim offered himself freely, or at least if the act of sacrifice could bear the appearance of a voluntary offering. We see, however, in these human sacrifices error and truth intersecting one another in unnatural confusion. One truth is, that man's

free sacrifice of himself to the deity is the noblest and highest offering, the flower of the entire worship consecrated to him; and the heathen error on the point in question was, that this self-sacrifice was not accomplished by the sanctification, but by the destruction, of life. Another truth is, that of all created things, man is the best and most acceptable to the deity,—the crown of creation; but pagan error again added to this the notion that man was distinct from the animal only in degree, of his personality not having an absolute, but only a relative, value, like any other possession; and hence, that an unqualified right, embracing life and death for the common good, was given to the race over its members, to the state over its citizens, corresponding to the rights of a master over his slave. If the Greeks still retained sacrifices of the kind in many places till a late date, they were undoubtedly founded on the vague notion that what had been introduced by the declared will of the deity himself, or by oracular bidding, could not be set aside without danger. Zeus, Dionysos, Artemis, Apollo, and Poseidon were the deities to whom human life was most frequently sacrificed. The oldest mythical histories present several examples of death voluntarily suffered for the sake of the community. In the historical period, the case of Cratinus at Athens is almost an isolated one; he offered himself to die as a sacrifice on the purification of the city by Epimenides.[1] And, precisely here, in the seat of all heathen humanities, in a city the inhabitants of which were distinguished above all the Hellenes for a milder and more compassionate disposition, the annual tragedy of a human sacrifice was exhibited. At the festival of the Thargelia, celebrated in honour of the nativity of Apollo, two persons as "scape-goats," decked with strings of figs, were conducted out of the town, and were obliged either to kill themselves by leaping from a rock, or were burnt alive, and their ashes sprinkled on the sea.[2] In this same Athens it was the custom, for purposes of state, to maintain certain people otherwise considered worthless and unprofitable, in order to sacrifice them as an atonement on the occasion of a disaster,

[1] Athen. xiii. 78.

[2] Hellad. *ap. Phot. Bibl.* c. 279, p. 534 (p. 1590); Harpocr. p. 291; Suidas, *s.v.* Tzetz. Chil. v. 23. 735 (? 756).

such as a pestilential sickness, befalling the state.[1] On the island of Leucas, also, a man, every year, was flung into the sea as an expiation for the people; but they tried to get him out, and, if successful, conducted him out of the jurisdiction.[2] With the Phocæans, it was to Artemis Tauropolos that a man was yearly burnt to death by way of sacrifice.[3]

As men were made victims of at Rhodes to Cronos,[4] and at Chios and elsewhere to Dionysos Omestes, these several rites must have been Phenician originally, and allied to the old worship of Talos in Crete, both of which deities were only hellenised imitations of the Asiatic Baal-Moloch. On the other hand, the human sacrifice, which continued to be offered to the Lycæan Zeus at Lycosura till a very late period, was genuine Hellenic;[5] there is positive evidence that it was the general Greek custom to immolate a human victim before setting out on a war expedition, or before a battle; and it is related of the Lacedæmonians that they offered one to Ares.[6] This usage, however, seems to have died out by the time of the Peloponnesian war. A milder form of human sacrifice, probably a substitution for the earlier infliction of death, which at the same time corroborates the primitive sacrificial meaning of the pouring out of blood before alluded to, consisted in this, that at least the blood of man should be shed to the divine honour; sacrifices of the kind were made to Artemis Orthia in Sparta by the flagellation of boys, and to Dionysos at Alea by the scourging of women.[7] In other places, criminals who had forfeited their lives were taken for the purpose. In Orchomenos, the maiden appointed to be sacrificed to Dionysos was allowed to save herself by flight from the very altar.[8] People in some places believed they could point out the time at which, or the person through whom, the customary sacrifice of a man had been displaced by that of an animal.[9]

To maintain that the sacrifice of atonement was the only original offering of the Greeks, and to derive all other

[1] Schol. *Aristoph. Eq.* 36.
[2] Strabo, x. p. 452 (? 660, Oxf.).
[3] Pythocl. *ap. Clem. Alex. Protrept.* p. 12.
[4] Porphyr. *Abstin.* ii. 54.
[5] Theophrast. *ap. Porphyr. de Abst.* ii. 27.
[6] Phylarch. *ap. Porph. l.c.* 55; Apollodor. *ib.* 56.
[7] Pausan. iii. 16. 6, viii. 23. 1.
[8] Plut. *Quæst. Gr.* 38.
[9] Paus. ix. 8. 1; Suid. *s.v.* Ἔμβαρος.

forms from it, would be inadmissible. To acknowledge in practice the supremacy and power of the divinity, to present it with a pledge, as it were, of homage and subjection to its will, to return thanks for gifts received, or protection afforded,—this was the primitive signification of many sacrifices. In the offering of the first-fruits of the soil would be implied an acknowledgment that the harvest was a favour owing to Zeus the god of the weather, and Demeter the goddess of crops, and that it might be spoilt by their ill-will. Even the Greek idea of the envy of the gods, and the necessity of appeasing this jealousy by a voluntary cession of a portion of their goods, was also the foundation of many sacrifices.

Thus there arose quite a graduated scale of offerings, from the most insignificant and worthless up to the most costly of man's possessions; but whatever was not fit to be owned, used, or eaten by men, was also unfit for sacrifice. Among the animals, bullocks, sheep, goats, and swine were most commonly taken for sacrifice; here and there dogs, and if for Artemis, game. Preference was given to swine for sacrifice to Demeter, he-goats to Dionysos, black cattle, and sometimes horses, to Poseidon, and black rams to Heracles. As a general rule, the animal which was held to be consecrated to any deity was not selected for sacrificing to that deity. Aristotle's notion,[1] that the first-fruits of field produce were the oldest kind of offering, whilst that of animals belonged to a later time, and further, swine were the first of the latter description to be sacrificed, are clearly mere conjectures, founded only on a superficial view of the later system of sacrifice, and certainly not borne out by facts. Indeed, the very frequent occurrence of human sacrifice in the oldest times of Greek myths and history flatly contradicts them.

The offering of a single animal was in many cases not enough; if there were the means, and a particularly urgent suit to press with the deity, or if only there were many to be feasted upon the meat of the sacrifice, a greater number of the same species of beast were killed. It was not only

[1] *Eth. Nic.* viii. 11. So too Plato, *Legg.* vi. p. 471, and Porphyr. *de Abst.* iii. 5, 6; vii. 27. This agrees with the view that the first gods of the Hellenes were the great constellations, as Plato surmises.

cities that did so, but private individuals. A hundred bulls, sometimes more, sometimes less, formed a hecatomb; or perhaps the number was made up by animals of another sort. Instances occur of as many as four hundred and fifty bulls being sacrificed to Zeus, and five hundred goats to Artemis Agrotera.[1] The animals were to be clean healthy, unblemished, and not yet put to use; and the Athenians could never understand how it was the gods so often gave the Lacedæmonians the victory over them, whilst they themselves of all the Greeks offered the most numerous and the fairest victims; while the Spartans, on the contrary, behaved so meanly to the deity, that they actually always brought what was mutilated to the altar.[2] In fact, the expense gone to at Athens with these sacrifices mounted by degrees to an excessive waste of animal life. On the other hand, the poor, to whom valuable domestic animals would have been too expensive to offer, brought cakes made in the shapes of animals instead of the reality; and it would also happen at times that apples were offered instead of sheep, on account of their resemblance in name.[3]

First and other fruits were sometimes merely laid in the streets, or in the open air, or hung up; pots with dressed vegetables were also set out. Drink-offerings, composed of wine, honey, milk, and oil, were chiefly joined with animals of sacrifice, but subsisted also by themselves in the form of simple libation. There were deities, too, who accepted no liquid offerings; and others again to whom a drink-offering, but only a sober one, that is, without wine, was presented. In the great proportion of this species of offerings amongst the Greeks, there was no general view or common practice to fall back upon, but every different race was guided by its own peculiar traditions. This was the case too with incense-offerings, for which, in early ages, fragrant wood, and soon frankincense, also came into use, and were presented either in combination with other gifts, or independently, as, for instance, on the feast of the Diasia, when fumigation only was offered to Zeus Meilichios.

Fire was the instrument of appropriation, as it were the mouth of the deity into which the victim was introduced, or

[1] Diod. xi. 72; Plut. *Malign. Heroa.* c. 26.
[2] Plat. *Alcib.* ii. 149. [3] Pollux, i. 30, 31.

which conducted the substance of it, in the form of smoke, to him. Holocausts, however, in which the animals offered were entirely consumed by fire, were not of frequent occurrence with the Greeks; they are not mentioned by Homer. Some few examples are found of them later.[1] The assertion of Hyginus, that all offerings were originally holocausts,[2] is probably without foundation. Such burnt-offerings were only made to the dead, to heroes, and deities of the nether world, who did not share them with the living, but claimed them all for themselves; and if in expiatory sacrifices, as in that which was devoted to Zeus Meilichios, the swine of the offering was likewise destroyed entirely by fire, this happened either because the guilt laid upon the beast made it unclean and unfitted it for the sacrificial feast, or because Zeus the atoner was originally identical with the Zeus of the lower world, or Hades.[3] Ordinarily only the shank-bones, enveloped in fat, were burnt; but later, in the post-Homeric period, liver and heart, and other parts not used for eating. The comic poets often used to make fun in many ways over this selfishness, which would appease or conciliate the favour of the gods, and yet put them off with the worst parts of the sacrifice.[4] But the low selfish view of the relation, as at a later time it may frequently have been represented, did not lie in the matter itself, or in the original practice; for the whole animal was consecrated to the deity, and became his own property by the act of oblation, and therefore man was the god's guest at the sacrificial repast.

A peculiar feature of the Greek system of atonement and oblation was the sacrifice of atonement made to Zeus the god of the weather, at fixed seasons of the year, when favourable weather was of great consequence to the Greek, in order to anticipate and avert the anger of the god, as expressed by inclement weather. In the sacrifice of the kind offered in honour of Zeus Maimaktes, *i.e.* the stormy, in November, even the fleece of the ram of sacrifice was consecrated as a powerful medium of expiation, insomuch

[1] Xen. *Anab.* vii. 8; Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.* iii. 1033.

[2] *Astron. Poet.* ii. 15. [3] Æsch. *Eum. Müller*, p. 139.

[4] See the passages of Eubulus, Pherecrates, and others, in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 716.

that those who were reconciled at other festivals trod upon it with their left foot.[1] The following is a remarkable example of another sacrifice of atonement, appointed to the same deity, Zeus, in which a mythical stain of blood cleaving continually to one family was dealt with. Sentence to die, as a victim, had passed upon the eldest of the Athamantid family, in case of his entering the Prytaneum, or town-hall. This fate he was allowed to escape by flight into a foreign country, and then a ram was sacrificed in his stead; but if he came back and was caught in the Prytaneum, he was then thickly swathed in fillets of wool, and led out to death in solemn procession as a victim of atonement.[2]

Purity, but only physical, was also required of the assistants at sacrifices; hence the rite of ablution of hands and aspersion with water, and the further custom of putting on clean clothes beforehand. Great stress was laid on the tractable behaviour of the victim; and in that we may recognise a remnant of the original substitutive notion of the animal sacrificed, and a feeling that the life of the beast really supplied for that of the man. They avoided dragging it to the altar by force; if it came up with readiness, it was held a particularly favourable token, and even then the priest further delayed the killing of it till by a movement of the head it had seemed to have indicated its consent. They knew, however, the way to produce this indication, by pouring water into the victim's ears.[3] They went still further at Delphi, where the required answer of the oracle was always withheld till a trembling, considered as divine, had seized all the limbs of the animal prepared for sacrifice.[4] The blood caught was poured out round about the altar, or into a hole if the sacrifice was one of atonement or for the dead.[5] Nevertheless the thought of the blood of the sacrifice having a purifying effect does not seem to have been an admitted one with the Greeks before the Christian era. Nothing was eaten of the burnt-offerings, or of those of expiation, or of the dead, or of such as, having for object the corroboration of an oath or a

[1] Polem. *Frag.* ed. Preller, p. 140. [2] Herodot. vii. 197.
[3] Plut. *Quæst. Symp.* viii. 8. 3; Schol. *Apoll. Arg.* i. 415.
[4] Plut. *de Def. Orac.* c. 46. [5] Athen. ix. 410 A; Pausan. ix. 39. 4.

contract, were charged with a curse: but as to the others, people joined in a sacrificial repast upon them, the guests at which partook of the roasted flesh of the animal, and joined with it drinking of the wine consecrated by libation, thus becoming guests of the deity, at whose table they were eating; whilst the provisions in common, hallowed by the god, formed at the same time a close bond of union amongst them. It was thus these hallowed banquets formed the principal object of, and most effective bond of union in, religious associations; and hence meal-time and sacrifice were so essentially connected together, that even the modes of expressing the two acts were frequently interchanged.[1]

Thus the Greeks knew how to lend to their sacrificial entertainments a cheerful character, calculated for the gratification of the senses. The sacrificers wore garlands of flowers on the head, and carried them in their hands. The gaiety was enhanced by religious dances, the circles of which were drawn in mimic motion of all the limbs round the altar and the sacrificial fires.[2] Hymns to the praise of the god were likewise combined with the act of sacrifice, or filled up the interval between the slaying of the victim and the time of the repast. Abuse, raillery, and provoking taunts on all who came within reach of the festive party were not only a matter of regulation in the worship of certain deities, more especially Demeter, but even prescribed by law.[3] All these appearances go to prove the fact that the graver aspect of the sacrificial worship, as it was manifested at least in particular points amongst other people, had with the Greeks receded considerably into the background; and it cannot be doubted that, in the period known to us, the whole system of sacrifice was comprehended by the great mass of the Greek people principally as a tribute to be paid or a gift to be presented to the deity. It was the prevalent idea, that for a man to obtain anything of the gods, he must of necessity make them an offering to correspond. "Presents win the gods as well as kings,"[4] was an old proverb. In Homer's time, they who boasted of the special protection or favour of any divinity,

[1] Diphil. *ap. Athen.* vii. 39.
[2] *Etymol. Magn.* p. 690.
[3] Aristot. *Polit.* vii. 15.
[4] Plato, *Rep.* p. 399 E.

usually alleged as the ground of it, that they had been to some considerable expense in his regard, or had studiously supplied his altar with the most acceptable offerings. "The gods," people thought, "do nothing gratis: the good things they make over to man were wares for which they expected a solid equivalent in return; everything was venal with them, and had its taxed price; health was to be purchased for a bull-calf, wealth for four oxen, a kingdom for a hecatomb. And there were things to be had in their market, it seems, for a fowl, for a garland of flowers, and for only a couple of grains of incense too." Lucian, who sketched this picture, referred at the same time to the Meleager legend, wherein all the ruin which had fallen on the house of Œneus was represented as owing to his having sacrificed at the vintage a hecatomb to all the gods, with the single exception of Artemis.[1]

Besides sacrifices, it was usual to offer consecrated gifts to the gods, which were preserved afterwards in the temples or other public places. These were ordinarily in thanksgiving for a victory, being saved from danger of death, or other benefit vouchsafed, or may be in consequence of a vow. They were often insignificant, though, when made by rich people, princes, or whole states, also often of great value, and enhanced by artistical execution; articles of plunder and tripods were particularly common. Delphi and Olympia were the shrines most sumptuously furnished with such objects. Young people used to cut off the hair of their head in honour of a deity or hero,—a thing frequently done by maidens before their marriage; and so the image of Hygieia at Titane, near to Sicyon, was entirely covered with hair so consecrated.[2] In many temples shapes of limbs that had been healed were to be seen suspended, as at Oropus in the temple of Amphiaraus; or votive tablets of seafaring people, who had been saved from shipwreck.[3]

[1] Luc. *de Sacrif.* c. 2 (iii. 68, Bip.).
[2] Pausan. ii. 11. 5.
[3] *Corp. Inscr. Gr.* i. p. 750.

VI. FESTIVALS

All the festivals of the Greeks had a religious character; they were festivals of gods, heroes, or the dead. In a religion founded on the deification of nature, it could not but be that states of nature, elemental phenomena, and dealings of man with nature and her gifts, should form the chief groundwork of their feasts; and that in so favoured a climate as that of Greece, intercourse with nature should give a cheerful tone; that the yielding to her and her influences, and sympathy with her phases, should invite rather to comfortable enjoyment than melancholy; and thus the Greek festivals, for the most part, received the impress of a glowing enjoyment of life, sometimes of a grossly sensual cast, at others of a finer and more artistic complexion. Only the memorial days, consecrated to the infernal deities and the dead, were of a more sombre colouring; and yet it might well happen, that a festival, the first days of which began in gloom, would conclude with the genial banquet and the dance, like the Spartan Hyacinthia, dedicated in part to the hero Hyacinthus, and in part to Apollo.[1]

So, then, the Greeks had, first of all, festivals of the weather. At Athens, Zeus Meilichios was fêted in February, because of the approach of the mild weather; in November, Zeus of the storms, to testify joy for the autumn weather, or to implore a favourable season. Further, there were feasts which were connected with the seasons, especially the spring; with agriculture, harvest, the vintage, and the wine-making, and hence the festivals of Demeter and Dionysos were the most numerous. Every year the Athenians solemnised as many as three special festivals in honour of the plough,[2] and besides, the Haloa, a feast of the threshing-floor, combined with a noctural solemnity. There were particular festivals held only in commemoration of any one of the local myths, with an exhibition representing its features; of this kind was the Dædala at Platæa, a festival grounded merely on some

[1] Pausan. iii. 16. 2; Strabo, 278 (402, Oxf.).
[2] Plut. *Conjug. Præc.* c. 42.

love-tale told of Zeus and Hera.[1] Not that important and glorious events, whether of the fabulous or historical period, were not chosen as subjects for feasts: the Athenians celebrated every year their victories at Marathon, Salamis, Platæa, and Naxos; as they also did the political settlement of Attica by Theseus, and the restoration of the democracy under Thrasybulus.

The great national feasts, common to the whole Hellenic race, were kept every four years at Olympia and Delphi, every two years at Nemea and on the isthmus of Corinth. Pausanias describes the Olympic festival at Elis as the most splendid pageant in Greece next to the Eleusinia. In it delegates from the Hellenic cities sacrificed in common at the altar of Zeus; yet the leading features of the feast were, as at the three others, the games. The Pythia, in honour of the Pythian Apollo, on the Crissean plain, not far from Delphi, were originally celebrated only with competitions for prizes for music, as being held in honour of the patron-god of the science; but gymnastic and chivalrous contests were early added, in imitation of the Olympia. The Nemæa were celebrated in honour of the Nemæan Zeus, in a sacred grove near Argos, and later, at Argos itself. The foundation of the Isthmia, to honour Poseidon, was attributed to Theseus; and under the fostering care of the wealthy and favourably situated Corinth, the solemnity became so much liked and frequented, that even the destruction of the city by Mummius could not interrupt it. A truce of god, or holy month, protected travellers resorting to these festivals, or returning home from them. In a similar manner, the Athenians kept their principal feast, the Panathenæa, during four days every four years, in honour of their patron-goddess. The carrying of the Peplos formed the centre of the whole solemnity: it was woven by the Attic women for the image of the goddess, and was brought in procession from the Ceramicus to the temple in the Acropolis. The pageant was got up with all the magnificence that the people of Athens could bring into play. Many kinds of gold and silver vessels were carried in it, and the two sexes of all ranks and ages took part in the solemnity, from the child

[1] Plut. *ap. Euseb. Præp. Evang.* iii. 1, p. 85.

to the grey-headed man, of whom the best-looking were selected.[1] Of the same kind was the festal solemnity of Apollo and Artemis at Delos, at which all the inhabitants of the adjacent islands, joined by a splendid embassage from Athens, met together.[2]

In the cycle of Athenian feasts, with which we are best acquainted, we can clearly see how inexhaustible were the materials for such solemnities in Hellenic paganism; and how strong the inclination to turn all that was trifling, and that involved no religious idea whatever, into account for festal ceremonies and diversion. The mere clothing of the images, and cleaning and washing of them or vestments, were, as we see, converted in the Callunteria and Plunteria into feasts of themselves. On the latter feast the temple of Athene was secured by women from intruders by a rope; and then the image of the goddess was divested of its garments, and remained covered up till it could show itself again in the newly washed ones.[3] No one presumed on this day to do anything. The principal action of the Scirophoria was a procession, in which the Eteobutadæ bore a great umbrella, in memorial of Athene having invented this protection against the sun's rays.[4] Here, in Athens, it was also deemed necessary to keep the Hydrophoria, a feast in commemoration of those who had perished in the flood of Deucalion a couple of thousand years before. They poured water and threw cakes into a chasm.[5]

There was more sense in the festivals relating to social and domestic life, on the transition from one age into another, and suchlike. Thus the Spartans held on the Tithenidia a festa of nurses and their foster-children. The Apaturia, so peculiar to the Ionic race that Herodotus alleges them as decisive tokens of Ionic descent and kinsmanship,[6] were appointed for the reception of newly-born children into their father's tribe or phratria, on which occasion a sacrifice was offered to Zeus Phratrios. The

[1] Xen. *Symp.* iv. 17; Schol. *Aristoph. Vesp.* 544.
[2] Plut. *Nic.* c. 3; Plat. *Phad.* p. 58.
[3] Pollux, viii. 141.
[4] Harpocr. p. 270; *Anecd.* Bekker. i. 304.
[5] Plut. *Syll.* 14; Schol. *Aristoph. Acharn.* 1075.
[6] Herodot. i. 147: cf. Schol. *Aristoph. Acharn.* 146.

feast of the Gymnopædia, in Lacedæmon, was for youths of riper years. In them the boys and young men, by dancing naked in the sweltering heat of the summer, hardened themselves for the patient endurance of greater trials;[1] and, as the women kept their own peculiar festivals and ceremonial observances apart, and mostly secret from the men, so the trades also had sacrificial rites of their own, appointed for the members of the guild alone.

Feasts were solemnised first and foremost by sacrifice; then by processions, gymnastic and orchestral competition, and musical and theatrical contests. The Greeks were more attracted to bodily exercises and games than any other people, and thus they also conceived their gods to be fond of the same amusements, as Plato says.[2] And then races were arranged, both foot and horse, with torches and in armour; people enjoyed chariot-racing, with two or four horses abreast, with fillies and mules; they contended for the honour of the prize-wreath at leaping, throwing the spear and discus, wrestling, and boxing. Those who desired more refined amusements satisfied their craving in the musical contests, first introduced at the Pythian games, and afterwards at the Isthmian and Nemean. Amongst the Megareans, even a kissing contest was held on the feast of Diocles.[3] Sumptuous testimonials of honour and a brilliant reception at home awaited those who had been victorious in such contests on any of the four national feasts; and great was the number of the Greeks who devoted their whole life to attain to proficiency in these gymnastic exercises, with the sole view of competing for the wreath of the conqueror. For the mass of the people, on most of the feasts, the competition for the prizes, the chori, and the solemn processions formed the principal attractions; and on their account these festivals were considered as the very cream of the whole of the Greek life, their periodical recurrence being expected with eagerness, and greeted with joy. This joy, and the splendour of many festivals, were further enhanced by the Theoriæ, or em-

[1] Plat. *Legg.* 633.
[2] *Cratyl.* 406.
[3] Theocrit. xii. 27; Schol. *ad l.*

bassies, which cities of kindred race were wont to despatch, to unite their homage with that which was offered to the god, in their names; and which made every exertion to do honour to their native city by the brilliancy of their appearance in public, the splendour of their equipage, the beauty of their garments, and the number and excellence of the animals provided for sacrifice. Thus, for example, in the Pythia a thousand bullocks and ten thousand beasts of other sorts were brought together.

The whole system by which the Greeks solemnised their festivals required that they should be held under the open sky, in the midst of the same natural objects which, after being deified and personified, were actually worshipped. Among the Greeks, therefore, many altars were erected, even till later times, in the open air, particularly under the shade of trees, and were the better adapted for festal purposes as the steam from the burnt-offerings had thus a freer escape into the atmosphere. The sacrifices of the dead too, which were repeated periodically in all the Greek states, a worship directed as well to the deities of the nether world as to the shades of the departed, who, thereby, in some measure were raised to the level of heroes, had for the most part to be celebrated in the open air; for in them a holocaust was consumed on the funeral pile, to which frequently costly objects, sent after the dead, were added, besides libations, and the pouring out of the blood of the victims into a hole.

VII. TEMPLES AND IMAGES

From the way of conducting festivals, we have already seen that the proper destination of the Hellenic temples was not to serve as places of religious assembly for public devotion, but that they secured a shelter for the image of the god, and a habitation for the deity supposed to be attached to his image. They were generally confined localities, and half dark within on account of the absence of all window light. Bright light was not required, as, in fact, no religious observances took place in the temple ordinarily.

Hence the smaller temples received their light only from the door; the larger or hypæthral ones also from above, where they were open in the middle of the roof. Sometimes too the temples were shut up, or had an adytum, a sanctuary that is, to which the priests only had access, with an image of a god concealed. Even where the image stood in open space it was customary to veil it by a curtain, only drawn back on feast-days. Paintings adorned the interior walls of the temple, which related to the character and actions or adventures of the deity; and votive offerings, sometimes of a costly description, filled the spaces between, or were kept in cells behind. Profane buildings, moreover, were not allowed in the vicinity of the space hallowed by the temple; and Pausanias praises the Tanagræans, because they, of all the Greeks, kept their shrines the most distant from all common habitations.[1] No one could enter the temple unless he had previously sanctified himself; in other words, had bathed in running water, and put on new or newly washed clothes. Besides this, there was the particular aspersion with the blest water to be found in the pronaos, which was taken by the hand, or on solemn occasions from a priest stationed at the entrance.[2] Garlands woven of leaves from the tree the god loved were likewise at hand for the worshippers on entering.[3]

We have already spoken of the oldest shapeless images of gods, consisting of rough stones, boards, and stakes. There were no beautiful images as yet in Homer's time. The images, which, descending from an early period, were esteemed particularly sacred, were of wood, carved, but rude, and with undivided feet, and eyes indicated by a line; the face coloured red or white, or gilt. It was only later that ivory and gold plates were commonly laid over the wood, vested and decked out with ornaments. Such images were regularly washed and clothed, and otherwise ornamented, and represented the god sitting, or standing straight up. In many places, even in the latter times of refined taste, the old, rude, stiff idols were carefully preserved, or were imitated if fallen into decay. But when

[1] Pausan. ix. 22. 2.
[2] *Corp. Inscr.* P. ii. n. 38; Pollux, i. 1. 8; Herodot. i. 51.
[3] Pausan. x. 32. 9; Lys. *c. Agoracr.* p. 500.

the plastic arts had freed themselves from the trammels of the archaic or priestly style, the colossal statues of Phidias were considered to reach the highest summit of excellence, such as could not have been attained without divine influence and revelation, in representing heavenly and unimpassioned dignity. His Olympic Zeus was regarded as a wonder of the world, a sight of which dispelled care and sorrow; and it was a great misfortune not to have had a glimpse of it before death. In after time, the decline in Greek morality and religious sentiment was also evidenced by the character of their images. Praxiteles, and other artists after him, ventured to employ professed courtesans as models for their statues of Aphrodite, now no longer clad as in early times, but generally naked, even in the case of idols intended for public worship.[1]

Plato suggests, as the ground of the worship paid to these images of the gods, the idea that such homage as man paid to these creatures, lifeless though they were, was recompensed by much grace and favour from the living gods invisible.[2] But it was not on this hope only that such image worship was built; and these representations were, in the eyes of the Hellenes, as well as of other heathenish people, not mere memorial tokens or symbols of their invisible deities; the real idea they had was much more that of worshipping the deity believed to be present in the image. In fact, they attributed to the hallowing rite, or consecration, by which the statue, when finished, was fitted for religious purposes, the power to attract the deity himself, so as that he dwelt in the image as the soul does in the body.[3] "When did the god begin to be?" said Minucius, expressing the view common both to Greek and Roman. "See, he is being cast, wrought, carved, and he is not yet god. See, he is leaded, put together, and set on end, and still he is not yet god. See, he is trimmed out, consecrated, and prayed to; and then, at last, he is a god, if a man design and devote him to that purpose."[4] Thus the blessing

[1] Pausan. ix. 27. 4; Athen. xiii. p. 591; Plut. *de Pyth. Orac.* 15.
[2] *Legg.* ii. p. 931.
[3] Aristoph. *ap. Poll.* i. 12; Manetho, *Apotel.* iv. 343, 569.
[4] *Octav.* i. 23.

of the image was described as the act whereby the god was inducted into the image, and had a particular abode assigned to him.[1] However, many images of the gods, which were only meant to serve as memorials, or for ornament, remained unconsecrated.

From the enormous number of great and small, metal, earthen, and wooden idols, one might reasonably have said of later Greece also that there were more gods than men to be found in some parts; for the Greek could not content himself with the public images and divine rites, but he must also have his gods in immediate contact with himself at home.[2] His house was therefore made up of sanctuaries, in which the greater part of the gods of the state religion were repeated over again. Ordinarily, in the court of the men's quarters an altar was set up to Zeus Herceios, as protector of the house; and sometimes, too, an image of this god, to which they used to present an offering of a pot of shell-fruit.[3] Further, the hereditary gods of race and family were arranged in compartments of the hall surrounding the front court, where they were treated with incense, cakes, and other sacrificial dainties. Next to the store-room the gods of the trade to which the family owed its livelihood or maintenance had their sanctuary; and especially Zeus Ctesios, whose image was kept in a shrine.[4] To him were the domestic feasts dedicated, with their prayers, sacrifices, and repasts; and from him health and wealth were asked. Hermes, the good demon, and the goddess of fortune had likewise their images and worship at many houses. In the middle of the men's hall stood the altar of Hestia, surrounded with a barrier. The representations of these gods were, it is true, but small for the most part, and of burnt clay or wood, or mere rude paintings; they were placed in shrines on the wall, which resembled niches formed like temples.

Each father of a family exercised the office of priest

[1] "Quæ Deum inducit." Quintil. *Decl.* 322.

[2] The speech of Lysias against Andocides (15-46) is a striking proof of the deep root the idea of the deity (through his image) dwelling along with him in his city had taken in the Greek mind.

[3] Cratin. *ap. Athen.* ii. p. 460: cf. Meineke, *Com. Fragm.* iii. 377.

[4] Suid. *s.v.*; Menander, *ap. Harpocr. s.v.*; Paus. i. 31. 4.

in the house for himself and family. Days of birth, marriage, and death were specially observed with domestic solemnities; so also fixed days of the calendar—such as the new moon, and the fourth and seventh day of every month; the former sacred to Hermes, the latter to Apollo. These home sanctuaries and rites must, however, have led to this result, that religion was exposed to the self-will and abuses of individuals in a much higher degree than was the case in the public and legalised worships; or that, as Plato says,[1] men who had in their houses sanctuaries and altars of their own grew more and more hardened in iniquity and all kinds of vice, by reason of the sacrifices and prayers through which they presumed to appease the gods in secret there; and on this account the philosopher advised the enactment of a law forbidding any one's having a sanctuary of a god in his private dwelling-house. Nevertheless this remained but a pious wish.

VIII. TRANSGRESSIONS AGAINST RELIGION, AND THEIR PUNISHMENT

The state religion, with all that was required for the service of the gods, was under the protection of the laws, and the punishment of acts, falling under the category of breaches of religion, was in most instances death. Hence a charge of impiety, *i.e.* an offence against religion, or of ungodliness, was a very serious and dangerous matter, and afforded an effective weapon wherewith to work the ruin of an adversary. Still, the idea of impiety, from the lack of a precise religious teaching on the one hand, and on the other from the wide extent of a religious system built upon the cultus of nature, was sometimes very confined, and then again quite the contrary, embracing so much that, in individual cases, the greatest scope was left to the interpretation and arbitrary will of the judges.

It is rather from historical examples, than from acquaintance with the laws passed upon them, that we know what acts constituted an offence against religion.

[1] *Legg.* x. p. 910.

Blaspheming the gods in word or deed was considered a crime deserving death; but the ridiculing of the gods in general, and of single deities in particular, could be practised on the stage at Athens without any token of disapprobation from people or magistracy. What was tolerated on the stage must have been permitted at home and in private life. Denial of the gods, however, or assertions from which atheism could be deduced, had the punishment of death as their consequence, as is proved by the instances of Diagoras of Melos, on whose head Athens set a price, and of Theodorus, who only escaped execution through the protection of Demetrius.[1] Further than this, every one forfeited his life who only attempted to introduce into Athens a worship not yet domiciled there, without the consent of the Areopagus and people. It is well known that the mutilation of an image, the communication of, or the mimicking of, rites and symbols occurring in the mysteries, was similarly atoned for by death. If a man entered the temple of Demeter while the Thesmophoria were going on; if any one satisfied the demands of nature in a temple of Apollo, or destroyed the least little tree of a sacred grove; or if a suppliant laid down the olive branch in the Eleusinium,—these all were simply capital crimes;[2] and though it were but a child or a mad person who committed the sacrilege, the doom was carried into effect all the same. Yet we also find that the cutting down of an olive-tree sacred to Pallas was punished with exile and loss of property.[3] When the Megarians had built upon a piece of ground dedicated to religion, they were prosecuted as offenders against the gods by a decree of the Athenian people. How easy it was to incur the charge of sinning against religion is shown, amongst other facts, by this, that when in the Epidaurian territory a grove had been consecrated to Hyrnetho the daughter of Temenos, even the taking away of brushwood from it was declared to be a punishable offence.[4]

Thus, then, the examples of executions on the score

[1] Ælian. *V. H.* ii. 23; Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 37; Diog. Laert. ii. 18. 15 (? 101).

[2] Andoc. *de Myst.* 54, 57, 58; Ælian. *V. H.* v. 17.

[3] Lys. 293.

[4] Pausan. ii. 28. 3.

of impiety are sufficiently numerous, and many of them prove how difficult it must have been for the most wary person to secure himself against an accusation and sentence of the kind. Already Æsop, the fable writer and contemporary of Crœsus, had been thrown down the crag of Hyampe at Delphi for blasphemy.[1] Atarbes was executed for striking a fowl sacred to Asclepios.[2] It was accounted a breach of religious duty in Phidias to have introduced his own likeness and that of Pericles in the battle of the Amazons which adorned the shield on the statue of Pallas; he was for this thrown into prison, where he died. At the same period Aspasia also was accused of impiety, and only the tears and prayers of her friend Pericles could save her from death.[3] The well-known Phryné afterwards fell into danger of her life on a like accusation. Then followed the decrees at Athens against Anaxagoras, Diagoras, Protagoras, and others. The charge of impiety might also be incurred by the exhibition of too great honour to the dead. Thus, the accusation against Aristotle was his having sung a pæan daily at his meals for his murdered friend Hermias the Platonist.[4] Earlier, while the Peloponnesian war was still afoot, the Sabazian priestess Ninus had been executed for introducing strange rites; while, afterwards, Glaucothea, the mother of Æschines, with the public approval, dispensed the same rites.[5] The case of the priest of the Phrygian mother of the gods being cast down the barathrum at Athens,[6] for introducing foreign rites, seems to have been an event of a yet earlier date.

[1] Herodot. ii. 134; Plut. *de Ser. Num. Vind.* p. 556. [2] Ælian. *V. H.* v. 17.
[3] Plut. *Pericl.* 32. [4] Athen. xv. 51, v. 551, Schweigh.
[5] Schol. *ad Demosth. de fals. leg.* p. 431; Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* p. 666.
[6] Suid. *v.* Μητραγύρτης; Schol. *Plut.* 431.

BOOK V

GREEK PHILOSOPHY, AND ITS INFLUENCE UPON THE RELIGIOUS SENSE AND CONDUCT OF THE PEOPLE. THE DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGIOUS IDEAS AMONG THE GREEKS FROM THE SIXTH CENTURY BEFORE CHRIST

I. Until Alexander the Great

The tradition of forefathers (who, it was believed, had lived in immediate intercourse with the gods); the prevailing mode of worship, and the state laws ordaining that worship; the answers and ordinances of the Delphic oracle; the narratives of the Exegetæ or guides at the temples; and lastly, Homer and Hesiod, who had composed their poems, revealing the nature of the gods, under divine light and inspiration,—such were the sources and foundations of a Greek's religious knowledge. There was as little of a manual of doctrine for him as of a system; whatever was doubtful or disputed had to be referred to the authorities mentioned, and decided by one or other of them as a rule of right. Since the epoch of myth-building had run out for the Greeks, the myths concerning the gods had passed from a living stream into the state of bare tradition; and the real meaning of the myths themselves had also been lost; yet, for all that, centuries through, they were simply credited by the mass of the people, among whom no effort was made to apply a searching test to their origin, value,

or signification; and at this point of simple and candid belief, still undisturbed by doubt or research of any kind, Pausanias found the Greek country population in the second century before Christ. There survived amongst them the memories of a time in which "immortal gods and mortal men partook of a common table, and lived under a common roof."[1]

The whole of nature was pervaded by a family of deities, descending from the elements as the primal gods, the individual members of which family were of kin to one another, and in mutual relations of higher and lower, older and younger, male and female, stronger and weaker, gods; so that man, feeling himself surrounded on all hands by gods, discovered, in the course of nature, and in the varieties of her phenomena, their actions and their histories, and manifestations of their will; and yet of these very beings that animated and directed nature he had only an anthropopathic conception; in their motives and passions they were to him but as more powerful and more perfect men: and this was the stage the religious conscience of the Greek people had attained up to the times of the Persian war.

But to remain quiet and in unruffled tranquillity of conscience at this level was not admissible in that rank and class of people, who, from their social position and life together in cities of considerable intercourse, were in a state of constant intellectual progress, and whom the pliability and elastic power of the Greek spirit were urging on and on in the search for a solution of the contradictions they met in their path.

It was the cosmogonic theogony, as propounded by the poets, Hesiod in particular, and already in fact a departure from the Homeric, which supplied the immediate material and the stimulus for that searching and creative activity in the inquiring spirit now astir amongst the Greeks. The cosmogonic problem, how out of a first being, the world, the multiplicity of finite things had arisen, next demanded a solution.

Here was the birthplace of Greek philosophy, that grandest and noblest fruit of Hellenic intellect; that

[1] Arat. *Phæn.* 91.

philosophy which a Christian doctor afterwards declared to be a gift which divine providence had itself intrusted to the best of the Greeks, as an education for Christianity;[1] and which indeed, from its very outset to the close of its career, found itself, sometimes in open, sometimes in covert opposition, more or less direct, to the state religion and the religious ideas of the people.

It was Pherecydes of Syros, the author of the oldest Greek prose on record, who published a cosmogony under a mythological garb. This contemporary of Thales, and, according to one account, tutor of Pythagoras, must have owed his education partly to the study of Phenician writings, partly to the instruction of Egyptian and Chaldee scholars. At the head of his theory of the development of the world he placed Zeus, or the Ether, a generative principle, good and perfect, with whom, as equally eternal and active in the creation of the world, he co-ordinated Cronos (Time, or Chronos, corresponding withal to the Phenician Baal), and, as the passive principle, to be moulded and formed, Chthon, or the still shapeless matter.

On this Chthon, or Chaos, the creative operation of Zeus was first employed in separating the solid and the fluid, as Earth (Ge) and Oceanos: and from these Cronos begot the three elements, fire, air, and water; consequently, with Earth, and the Ogenos, there were five substances apart, in five different recesses, folds, or clefts.[2] Uniting love alone could perfect the work of so blending and binding these five elementary substances one with the other that the great Cosmos should arise therefrom organically formed; Zeus, therefore, changed himself into Eros, and thus begot of the five substances five families of gods,—gods of the stars, air, earth, and sea; amongst whom are

[1] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 693, 694.

[2] Preller (*Hell. Encykl.* Abth. iii. Bd. xxii. p. 242) persists in counting the Ether, that is, Zeus, as the fifth substance; but he who fashions organically all other substances cannot himself be one of the substances to be worked up or moulded into the Cosmos. Rather, this fifth substance is "Ogenos," whom people must not, as usual, confound with "Oceanos." Jacobi (*Über die Fragmente des Pherecydes bei den Kirchenvätern*, 1850, pp. 8 *et seq.*), supported by the important passages, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 2, p. 741, ed. Pott., and Orig. *adv. Cels.* vi. 42, has demonstrated this correctly, as it seems to me, explaining the word from the Semitic, the "close-prisoning, fast-holding Hades."

to be reckoned Ophioneus, the serpent-god, and the Ophionidæ, engendered probably of the substance of Ogenos, or Tartarus. Then a great war of gods took place, Cronos being leader of one party, Ophioneus of the other. The prize for the victors was the possession of heaven, which the Ophionidæ coveted; but it was stipulated that they who should be thrust into Ogenos should be considered the vanquished party.[1] Since then Ogenos, or Tartarus, is the kingdom of everlasting unrest, guarded by northern tempests, harpies, and the whirlwind; and into it Zeus hurls the gods if they revolt against the government of the world. Here then is, with his Ophionidæ, Ophioneus, evidently the Persian Ahriman, who, pressing with his host of Dews and Darudis into heaven, was worsted in battle with Ormuzd and his host of Amschaspands, and sank back into his dark dwelling, the abyss of Duzahk; only that, in the Persian, Ahriman is physical and moral evil hypostasised together, whilst the Ophioneus of Pherecydes was only the wild ungovernable power of nature personified, like the Titans and Giants. The probability that the cosmogony of Pherecydes was of Oriental origin is increased by the symbol it used,—the winged oak, or rather the oak overshadowed by wings,[2] representing the world tree, extending its branches over the earth; a symbol (similar to the Scandinavian ash, Ygdrasil) which occurs frequently in India and Persia, as also in the pictures at Nineveh.

About the year 600 B.C., Thales the Milesian made the first decided step out of the narrow limits of mythological speculations into the open field of philosophy and unfettered thought. He stripped of their personality Oceanos and Tethys, whom Homer had placed at the head of his genealogical tree of the gods, and taught that water or fluid was that primal thing out of which everything had come, and into which all was resolved; thus assigning it in his system the place of the Hesiodic chaos, from which the world, gods and men, were made. His assertion, that everything was full of deities,[3] is to be explained upon the ground of the gods being in reality but personi-

[1] Orig. *adv. Cels.* vi. 42.

[2] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 6, p. 767, Pott.: ἡ ὑπόπτερος δρῦς.

[3] Aristot. *de Animâ*, i. 5. 411 (p. 30, Trend.); Diog. Laert. i. 27.

fications of the powers at work in nature. Generally it was the endeavour of this oldest of the Ionic philosophies to deduce the origin of all things from one simple radical cause, a cosmical substance, in itself unchangeable, but entering into the change of phenomena; and this was why these philosophers had no room in their doctrine for gods, or transmundane beings, fashioning and ruling things at will; and, in fact, Aristotle also remarked [1] of the old physiologists, that they had not distinguished the moving cause from matter. In their inner sense, therefore, they were already at variance with the popular religion, though still accommodating themselves to it in the usages of language.

Anaximander of Miletus was a disciple of Thales, his junior by about thirty years. The principle from which he evolved all things was one bearing a considerable resemblance to the Hesiodic chaos, namely, a substance in space unlimited, and in form undetermined, or an all-comprehensive matter, in which the motive power was already indwelling, and out of which, at the beginning of the world, by a process of separation of the opposites of warm and cold, dry and moist, individual things were formed, which again, obeying the same laws, fall back into their primitive chaotic state, to evolve themselves anew in order to a subsequent creation of the universe.[2] This infinite substance was, he said, immortal and imperishable, and he designated it, hylozoistically, as the deity.

On the other hand, Anaximander's successor in the list of Ionian philosophers, Anaximenes of Miletus, whose death seems to have occurred in the year 502 B.C., by adopting a determinate primal element, returned to the original ground occupied by Thales. According to his teaching, this primal element, infinite and divine, of itself imperceptible, and only obnoxious to sense in its modifications, was the air; from which, in perpetual motion through a constant process of change that was always one either of condensation or rarefaction, everything in nature was formed. The gods themselves originated in this air element, and therefore

[1] *Metaph.* i. 3. 984.

[2] Aristot. *Phys.* i. 4; Simplic. in *Phys. f.* 6; Plut. *de prim. frig.* ix. 733; *De plac. philos.* ix. 472, Rsk.

were material, finite beings, subject to the possibility, and perhaps to the necessity, of perishing.[1] He too, like Anaximander, accepted a constant succession of creation and dissolution of worlds.

Diogenes of Apollonia, a contemporary of Anaxagoras, and the youngest of the Ionian school of natural philosophers, was the nearest allied in doctrine with Anaximenes, except that, according to him, the primal air-like element, while it is the first of beings, is at the same time intelligent, and penetrates as life, soul, and understanding, the whole universe of existences, which for this very reason exhibits so much of harmony and order;[2] and therefore also life and thought, in all creatures, are produced by the air they inhale. The question occurs, however, had not Anaximenes already hit off this notion? for later authors attributed it to him also.[3] At all events, this attempt to connect a world-creative intelligence with the Ionian materialism and hylozoism involved Diogenes in inextricable contradictions.

About the year 500 B.C., a deeper view into the whole of natural life was taken by the proud and daring Ephesian Heraclitus, known in antiquity by the name of the obscure. What Anaximenes understood by the "air," Heraclitus meant by his "fire," an ethereal substance as primal matter, the all-pervading and animating soul of the universe; a matter which he conceived to be not merely actual fire, but caloric; and this being at the same time the only power at work in the world all-creative and destructive in turns, was, to speak generally, the one real and veritable existence among all things. For everything had its origin only in the constant modification of this eternal and primal fire: the entire world was a fire dying out and rekindling itself in a fixed succession, while the other elements are but fire converted by condensation or rarefaction into a variety of forms. Thus the idea of a permanent being is a delusion; everything is in a state of perpetual flux, an eternal going-to-be, and in this stream spirit is hurried along as well as body, swallowed up and born afresh; and therefore it was

[1] Hippolyt. *Philos.* c. vii. pp. 12, 13; Simplic. in *Phys. f.* 32; Plut. *de plac. philos.* ix. 473, Rsk.; *De prim. frig.* 734.

[2] Simplic. in *Phys. f.* vi. 32, 33; Aristot. *de Animâ*, i. 2.

[3] Simplic. *l.c.* and Philopon. in Aristot. *de Animâ*, i. 2.

said of Heraclitus he had swept rest and repose clean out of the world. World developments without number are repeated according to this doctrine; but war is the beginning of all things, as Heraclitus said, meaning that the transformation of the primal substance began in a constant severing, an entering into a state of conflict with itself, to be put an end to by the reconciliation or recombining of the opposite. By this law of endless contention, or movement of opposites, from war to peace, and from this again to war, all things were dominated as by an unalterable necessity or "destiny."[1]

Heraclitus, as any thorough-going pantheist would, called the common soul of the world, the all-comprehending primal fire, Zeus; and the flux of perpetual change and tendency to be, into which it enters, he termed poetically Zeus playing by himself. Zeus, or the world-soul when divided, becomes either deities or souls of man or brute, and "the wisest among men are as far removed from the gods as apes are from men." Hence "we live the death of the gods and die their life"; in other words, the gods are immortal men, and men mortal gods. For the soul of man has degraded from a higher (divine) scale of being to a lower, and thus finds itself in the body in a state of constraint and incarceration, out of which the so-called Death releases it; and if it has shown itself worthy, admits of its being again exalted to that higher level, while on the other hand impure souls find their place in Hades.[2]

There was no room for human freedom in such system; a mere voluntary subjection to the iron, all-determining law of succession beseemed the wise man. Heraclitus indulged in bitter invective against the popular religion, at least some particular features of it. "They address prayers to images," he said of his own countrymen; "they might just as well enter into conversation with their houses." He said of purifications by the blood of sacrifice, it was like a man washing himself in filth.[3] His repugnance to the myths of

[1] The fragments of Heraclitus, and the testimonies regarding him, are to be found at length in Zeller's *Philosophy of the Greeks*, i. 450–490 (2nd edition).

[2] Diog. Laert. ix. 1–15; Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* vii. 126–135; Hypotyp. iii. 230; Hippolyt. *Philos.* 9, 10; Plut. *fac. Lunæ*, c. 28.

[3] Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* p. 33; Elias, *Cret. ad Greg. Naz.* p. 836.

the gods, and the way they had passed from their authors, the poets, into the popular mind, is betrayed in an expression of his: "One must have Homer," *i.e.* the rhapsodists singing his poems at the games, "expelled by the public constable from the festal solemnities, because his works stuff the people with unseemly notions." His followers in Plato's time were still widely spread in Ionian Asia Minor and elsewhere, but, as was afterwards proved in the case of Protagoras and Cratylus particularly, had made an advance upon their master's doctrine of unrest and the perpetual flux in nature, to the renunciation of everything solid and enduring, and to the denial of a real existence; while they extracted out of it a harsh, sensualistic theory of perception and knowledge, leaving the sensitive faculty to be the only source and standard of our knowledge, as well as our conduct; a system which gained them great favour till the time of Socrates. Meanwhile, according to Plato's description,[1] the alternations of non-repose and non-consistence, which they observed everywhere in the world, were also communicated to their system, and thus they left nothing in their own doctrine and notions which they did not quarrel about.

There is nothing hardly to be said of a philosophy of Pythagoras of Samos, who flourished about the year 525 B.C., but only of a system formed by the later Pythagoreans, and in particular Philolaus and Archytas, in which it is impossible to distinguish what belonged to the master, and what to the scholars. There is little certainty about the personal history of Pythagoras, though it is beyond doubt that he had a strong inclination to mathematical pursuits, with an earnest religious disposition, and that he established in the Greek cities of Lower Italy a society which combined an ascetic mode of life, based in part upon the doctrine of the migration of souls, with peculiar religious and philosophical tenets. This association or order, however, was soon destroyed by force, during the life of its founder, and never reappeared in the same shape. The dispersed Pythagoreans continued to form a religious and philosophical sect, and were not only readmitted into the cities of Magna Græcia, but isolated members were to be met with in Thebes and other cities of the mother-country.

[1] *Theætet.* iii. 692, Bekh.

They died out at last about the year 300 B.C., when their doctrines had become antiquated, and were supplanted by other systems.

Aristotle says of the Pythagoreans, that "mathematics were their philosophy." Their master seems to have started with the notion that a mathematical conformity to law, expressible in numbers, was manifest throughout the universe, into whatever province of it you might glance. This was further extended to a first principle and centre of a system; and as all things were reducible to numbers, Number was the essence, the living principle of things, and the entire world appeared essentially a world of numbers, and thus numbers were the medium of the knowledge of all. For, in opposition to the Ionian primal substances of fire or water, an immaterial and simple principle, yet one that was inherent in everything, had to be found, and this was presented in number, consisting of unities, these in sum forming a single unity. The basis of numeration was by the Pythagoreans termed simply number, and so they laid down the undeveloped One, the absolute, indivisible unity as the divine, original substance at the root of everything, and from which numbers and things sprang. Consequently the entire world was developed out of that primal One, containing *in posse* the collective nature of numbers, and of things regarded as numbers. And not merely the physical, but the intellectual world was also thus derived from number, and comprehended in numbers, or, all things were explained as being resemblances of numbers, in so far as the general nature of number was individually represented in them. Things, it was said again, regarded in their essence as mathematical quantities, are numbers, but, considered in relation to our senses, are only copies and imitations of numbers. And as number, being the unity of the opposite (straight and crooked, finite and infinite, for instance), is also harmony, so is the universe itself a mighty harmony, composed of number and measure.

What a deal of trouble and ingenuity, it is evident, has been expended here in order to construct a material principle out of a mere formal principle, One as the root of number!

A number, however, is no active power at all; and even

Philolaus did not get beyond an arithmetical notion with his primal unity, even though he is said to have styled it god, and taught that both the finite and the infinite owed existence to it.[1]

According to the Pythagorean cosmology, the whole world is a single closed ball, in whose centre is the central fire,—"the Hestia of the universe, or the guard of Zeus, the link and measure of the whole of nature." Around it lie three regions with the ten divine globes; the "heaven," from the earth (also sphere-shaped) as far as to the moon; the "cosmos," from the moon to the heaven of fixed stars; and from thence the extreme circle or seat of the gods, the Olympos.[2] Here was a great step taken: antiquated ideas of the earth's disk swimming in the ocean, and the crystal bell of heaven encircling the earth, were thrown aside; people now taught, on geocentric principles, that the sphere-shaped celestial bodies, sun, moon, and planets, moved in circular orbits about the fixed terrestrial ball; not but that at the same time they learnt that the sun was a glassy body, borrowing its light from the central fire, while to the earth a counter-earth, or antichthon, was to be added. Of course, doctrine like this, so strongly opposed to the old astronomical notions, hallowed by the popular system of gods, must have been long kept behind the scenes.

The deity, or absolute Monad,[3] of the Pythagorean system, is not from eternity external to the disposition of the world, but whole and undivided in it, though not subject to the changes in the world; on the contrary, it is itself immovable; the spirit, the living power, and moving principle of, or that which mingles all.[4] His power is so far limited as matter with its imperfection (the Dyad) stands opposed to it, and thwarts it in conducting everything to its best state.[5]

This god, however, is no other than the world-soul materially conceived, which, proceeding from the Hestia, penetrates the world in all its parts as its vital power,

[1] Syrian. in *Aristot. Metaph.* xiii. p. 102.
[2] Stob. *Ecl. Phys.* p. 21, 8, 59, 360, 488; Aristot. *de Cœlo*, ii. 13.
[3] Nicom. *Arithm.* p. 109.
[4] Clem. Alex. *Protrep.* p. 47; Cyrill. *contra Jul.* p. 30.
[5] Theophr. *Metaph.* ix. p. 322, 14.

and also embraces it externally.[1] Hence, according to the expression of Philolaus, God holds the universe together as it were in prison. Cicero, too, understood the Pythagorean doctrine in a like sense.[2] The dualism of a divine world-soul, and of a world without a beginning and indestructible, originating, as the Pythagoreans said, not in time, but only in idea, still resolves itself into a unity of principle, inasmuch as they conceived the principle of the dyad (or matter, and the world that had come out of it), not as superadded externally to that of the monad, but deduced from the monad, so far as it separates itself off from itself, and thereby becomes a dyad.

The Pythagorean notion of souls was that they were of the nature of light, and parts of the divine soul of the universe; the souls of the gods proceed immediately out of the central fire, those of men come but from the sun's light, which is the reflection of the other. They also applied to ethics their notion of the limiting principle as the fashioning and form-giving one, and of the unlimited as the chaotic one, still void of proportion and form; the good, in their view, was the limiting rule; the bad, the irregular and limitless: besides, the soul of man was an image of the universe; here, as there, the same law was in force. According to Aristotle, Pythagoras himself had already reduced virtue to numbers; and Philolaus, who also designated the lie as the discordant and the indefinite, did the same in a still clearer way.[3]

The Pythagorean association, before as well as after its dispersion in Lower Italy, had an essentially religious tendency and import. The political part it played for a short time in Croton and some other cities, was rather a consequence of its strong organisation, and of the civil position of the greater portion of its members on the spot who belonged to the aristocracy, than of any plan preconceived or based upon the spirit of the order.[4] They made no attempt to acquire political influence in Greece; they existed

[1] Philol. *ap. Philon. de mundi op.* p. 24, 10, ed. Mangey, *ap. Athenag. Leg. pro Chr.* 6: comp. Böckh's *Philolaos*, p. 151.

[2] Cic. *N. D.* i. 11.

[3] Cic. *de Senec.* c. xxi.; Diog. Laert. viii. 7; Plut. *Plac.* iv. 7.

[4] This, too, is substantially Grote's view, *History of Greece*, iv. 544.

throughout as a religious sect only, with a religious mystery system of the Baccho-Orphic kind, and a mode of life corresponding; for in fact it was the Pythagoreans who were the chief composers of the Orphic poems, and enlarged the creed distinguished by that designation.

The immortality of the soul, under the form of its transmigration, was a fundamental doctrine of the Pythagoreans, and with it their worship of Dionysos-Zagreus was most intimately connected. It was this dogma, in fact, which formed the medium of union between the Orphic school and themselves, a union already effectuated in the time of Herodotus, and not unlikely the work of Pythagoras himself, inasmuch as, according to the account of Ion of Chios, he, or one of his first scholars, fathered a poem on Orpheus. The doctrine in reality was perfectly adapted for serving as the basis and bond of union for an exclusive religious order; and as Pythagoras extended metempsychosis even to the migration of souls through the bodies of animals, peculiarities in the mode of life and sundry abstinences were accordingly appended, as, for instance, from beans, flesh, meat, and certain fish; and all bloody sacrifices were avoided with horror. This view was originally unknown to the Greeks, nor are any indications of it to be found in their mythology. The people remained in essentials attached to the Homeric conception of a realm of shadows, and a kind of semi-corporeal existence of the dead there. Thales, and other Ionian philosophers, saw in the souls of men portions of the world-soul, which indeed had the principle of motion inherent in them, and thus were not annihilated at death, but again absorbed into the universal element, and so much so that Thales himself attributed a soul to the magnet, as attracting iron.[1] Pherecydes of Syros was the first to put forward in writing the immortality of the soul, *i.e.* the transmigration of it;[2] from him it was received by Pythagoras, whom tradition represents as personally connected with him. The Pythagoreans put the doctrine as a new revelation into the mouth of their great

[1] Aristot. *de An.* i. 2. 22; Nemes, *de Nat. hom.* 2; Stob. *Ecl. Phys.* i. p. 2.

[2] Cic. *Tusc.* i. 16; Divin. i. 50; *Augustini Ep.* 137; Tatian, p. 14 (103, Otto). The latter designates Pythagoras as κληρονόμος τοῦ Φερεκύδους δόγματος: cf. Pherecydis, *Fragm.* ed. Sturz, pp. 13, 14.

prophet and master, on whom the gift of remembering an earlier existence in other bodies had been bestowed in a miraculous way. Herodotus, however, asserts positively that the Greeks acquainted with this dogma were appropriators of the intellectual acquisitions of a stranger, and had borrowed it from Egypt; though, as he composed his work at Thurii, in the heart of the Pythagoreans, he declined mentioning them and their founder by name from motives of delicacy.[1]

Metempsychosis among the Pythagoreans, however, was much more of a religious dogma than a pure result of their speculations upon the soul. When Philolaus called the soul a harmony of the body and a number,[2] harmony being a numerical relation, it was rather the dissolution and mortality of the soul (as something compounded with, or as only attached to, the body) that seemed to be the logical result of the expression than its immortality. Or, suppose the individual soul, as Pythagoras and his followers taught,[3] a portion or scintilla of the divine world-soul, or power, disseminated through the universe, ruling and giving shape to matter; in that case the admission was an easy and proximate one, that the soul returned, at death, into the world-soul or central fire—in other words, the bosom of the godhead. A return of such kind, and so soon after death, was not, however, taught; we should say rather, the school, partially at least, must have supposed a pre-existence of the human soul, and a condition of guilt incurred previously in a higher or extra-corporeal state; souls moving in the air, which had either not yet passed into bodies, or had been again separated from them, they called demons and heroes.[4] By way of punishment, as they asserted, these souls were disparted from the godhead into the grave or prison of the body: and, according to the use they made of this state of penance and purification, were again exalted after death to the higher incorporeal existence in the Cosmos; or thrust down into Tartarus for a heavier punishment, or continued their migrations through a variety of bodies of men and beasts. Pythagoras himself had seen the soul of Hesiod

[1] Herod. ii. 123.
[2] Macrob. *Somn. Scip.* i. 14; Claud. *Mamert. de stat. animæ*, ii. 7.
[3] Cic. *N. D.* iii. 11.
[4] Diog. Laert. viii. 32.

fastened to a pillar in Hades, and that of Homer hanging on a tree, surrounded by serpents: in this way the two poets were compelled to do penance for what they had said of the gods.[1]

Pythagoras himself—and this is an acknowledged fact—believed and taught that men's souls after death migrated even into the bodies of beasts. His contemporary, the philosopher Xenophanes, informs us that once when he heard the howling of a dog, whose master was beating it, he entreated him to stop, because he recognised the soul of a friend in the cry of the dog.[2] Pythagoras asserted of himself that he had been several times on earth already: first he was Æthalides, next Euphorbus, at the time of the Trojan war; again he appeared as Hermotimus, and, later still, as Pyrrhus, a fisherman of Delos.[3] Upon this mythos, as he terms the Pythagorean doctrine, Aristotle remarks with censure, "according to it, any given soul may go into any given body, whereas each body has its own form and peculiarities."

The system of the Pythagorean school had but little of interior sympathy with the Hellenic religion, and, while it still endeavoured by partial approximations to maintain an appearance of friendly terms, the Eleatic school, almost contemporaneous, and starting from a kindred pantheistic point of view (in the same way as Heraclitus did), betrayed an undisguised enmity to the prevailing religious belief.

Xenophanes, born in Colophon 617 B.C., after a long stay in Sicily, had settled in the newly founded colony of Elea, about the year 536. His bold combating of the popular religion and prevalent system of deities, which formed the main business of his life, may possibly have drawn upon him expulsion from his parent state. His polemics against the gods were so famous in antiquity, that Aristotle quotes him as the classical teacher on this subject. "It may well be," said he, "that the ordinary ideas about the gods are neither good nor correct, nay, that what Xenophanes believes may be very much the

[1] Diog. Laert. viii. 21; Aristot. *de. An.* i. 3.
[2] Xenophan. *Fragm.* 7, ed. Schneidevin; Diog. Laert. viii. 36.
[3] Diog. Laert. viii. 4–5; Tertull. *de An.* c. 28.

case with the gods; but the multitude is now, in fact, of another way of thinking."[1] Timon, the "sceptic," styled Xenophanes "the scorner of the Homeric imposture," on account of the ridicule which he heaped upon Homer and Hesiod, the popular religious guides.[2] Turning his attack against the entire heathen system of anthropomorphism, Xenophanes thought it unbearable that those poets should have ascribed to the gods everything men held disgraceful and unworthy—theft, adultery, and deceit.[3] "If oxen and lions had hands to paint" (this was his style of banter), "they would represent their gods in the forms of oxen or lions, just as the Ethiopians do their deities black and flat-nosed, and the Thracians theirs with blue eyes."

The philosopher of Elea went on to combat the multiplicity, limited nature, and humanisation of the Hellenic deities, maintaining as follows: "God who is, and can be, but one, and can as little begin to be as cease to exist, is therefore immortal. He has no parts, but is the same throughout, absolute Intelligence and Insight, so that he, in his essence, sees, hears, thinks, and rules all things by the spirit without fatigue." With all these assertions of monotheistic sound, Xenophanes was still a pantheist, and, indeed, a material pantheist, and is universally understood to be such by the ancients.[4] Certainly there was present to his mind the idea of a being, one and spiritual, embracing the whole complement of existence and thought within himself; yet this being was in his view but the general nature-power; the unity of God was to him identical with the unity of the world, and this again but the manifestation of the invisible being, called God, and therefore also he explained it to be uncreate, everlasting, and imperishable.

If Xenophanes approximated to the Ionic philosophy in his system, which bears on its front a thoroughly physical character, his disciple, Parmenides of Elea (about 500 B.C.) developed, on the other hand, the independent form of Eleatic speculation. Plato gives him the title of "the great," and calls him "a noble spirit of extraordinary

[1] *Poet.* 1460, vi. 36.
[2] *Ap. Sext. Emp. Hypot.* i. 224.
[3] *Ap. Sext. Emp. adv. Math.* ix. 193.
[4] Cic. *Acad.* iv. 37, 118; Plut. *ap. Euseb. Præp. Evang.* i. 8. 4; Sext. Emp. *Hypot.* 225.

depth," in whom was verified the Homeric saying, "worthy alike is he, and dread."[1] In opposition to the early physical school and their material principle, and to Heraclitus, who in all existence saw only a continual "becoming," he attained to the idea of a pure and perfectly simple being. As philosophy hitherto had investigated the primal substance, the matter or the power, which, in the moment preceding the development of the world, still potentially included the distinctions which were to unfold themselves out of it by natural necessity; so Parmenides attained to the consciousness that on this point the intellect was forced to that commonest notion, comprehending all that is real or conceivable of a being which, not distinct from itself, and without parts, or opposites, is therefore so truly divested of all sensible and contingent attributes, that it ever exists without motion, fixedly and immutably the same, and therefore without a present in time; and one can neither predicate of it that it was, or that it is going to be. And while Xenophanes had persisted in investing his "being," as the highest of thinking existences, with personal attributes, the disciple excluded all such, yet affirmed not that this being of his was the deity, as little as he explained it to be identical with the world; and this in fact he was prevented from doing for the very reason that he denied all multiplicity and mutability, and therefore could not give that absolute, motionless being of his (which he, otherwise, compares to a round ball, in all parts equal and alike) the name of "world," a name which proclaims an order and a harmony of the manifold. Nevertheless his "being" was not a pure metaphysical idea, for he so expressed himself as to seem to represent it at one time as corporeal, and extended in space, at another as thinking. "To think, and the object of which the thought is, are one and the same," was a saying of his.[2] Two other Eleatics, Zeno and Melissus, were also partakers in this view. Thus "thinking" was one of the predicates of the Eleatic "being," and appertained to it exclusively.

[1] Soph. p. 237; *Theætet.* p. 183.

[2] *τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ νοεῖν ἐστίν τε καὶ εἶναι.* Zeller, however, seems to give a somewhat different interpretation to the passage. Vol. i. n. 1, p. 398, 2nd edit. (Tr.).

There was no bridge for Parmenides that had led from this pure simple "being" to the world of phenomena, of the manifold, and of motion; and therefore he denied the reality of all we see: the whole world of sense owed its existence only to the illusions of sense and the empty notions of mortal men built thereon.[1] In the second part of his philosophical treatise, however, he showed how the world of phenomena was to be contemplated and explained, if one were obstinately bent on considering it, no matter how erroneously, in the light of something real. He there spoke of a deity enthroned in the heart of the universe, the progenitor of gods and all things, sometimes sending souls out of life and sometimes into life,—ideas which come very near the Pythagorean, or were borrowed outright from that system.[2]

Of the two disciples of Parmenides, Zeno and Melissus, and the last philosophers of the Eleatic school, we know that while they maintained their master's doctrine unaltered in essentials, they set to work to fortify it with a skill in dialectics unknown in earlier periods, while they demonstrated the eternity, unity, infinity, and immutability of being: but Zeno in particular, who was the inventor of ingenious proofs directed against the multiplicity and motion of things, carried the doctrine to its culminating point. Melissus, going beyond Parmenides, argued from the infinity of being in time to its infinity or unlimitedness in space, though he refused to allow it corporeal density and divisibility. His expression, that it was best to decline all explanation in regard of the gods, as there was no knowledge about them,[3] shows that he considered it dangerous to define clearly the relations of his teaching with the popular religion.

Empedocles of Agrigentum (from 492 to 432 B.C.) stood apart from the schools mentioned hitherto. He was an extraordinary man, who enjoyed a great reputation on the strength of his threefold capacities of priest, prophet, and physician. Imagining himself in possession of magical

[1] Parmenid. *Fragm.* in Mullach's *Ausg. des Aristot. de Melisso, Xenophane, et Gorgia*, Berlin, 1845, pp. 111–121.

[2] Simplic. *Phys.* 8 A, 9 A; Jamblich. *Theol. Arithm.* p. 8.

[3] Diog. Laert. ix. 24.

powers, and rivalling Pythagoras, like him he became early a hero, enveloped in the nimbus of miraculous legend.[1] We recognise in him the influence, and some of the doctrines, of all the three leading minds of the period—the Ionic, Eleatic, and Pythagorean: still he went on his way, eclecticising, or combining, in his own fashion, the three methods, and laid down the result of his physiological speculations upon nature and the origin of the universe in a great doctrinal poem, wherein many times he copied Parmenides, whilst he served himself as a model for Lucretius. Here, like an inspired seer, he threw out, in powerful and picturesque language, doctrines and views which, on the one side, proved particularly agreeable to the Hellenic priests, and, on the other, so charmed the Epicurean Lucretius, that they seemed to him to have welled forth from a divine bosom.[2] Yet in him the edge and precision of thought was frequently dulled by the plastic imagination of the poet; and hence Plato characterised him as the languid and soft Sicilian Muse, in opposition to the sterner and more vigorous Heraclitus.[3] Still, his whole system of natural philosophy, as regarded the universe and its causes, was but the prelude and means to his leading object, his Pythagorising doctrine of purification and abstinence, propounded principally in the *Catharmoi*, or expiative pieces, in connection with the philosophical poem.

Just at the outset of his poem Empedocles explained there was an everlasting law of divine necessity in force, that the demons, who in a higher and blissful existence had defiled themselves by the destruction of a living creature, should wander about for three myriads of *ages* in exile, far away from the immortals. Accordingly he himself is "an erring fugitive and vagabond upon earth, fallen from a high dignity and the plenitude of bliss:" he having first discovered and deplored the strange and unwonted command, was now "a wayfarer amongst mortals, in a land devoid of peace and rest, where murder and envy and hosts of other unlovely things, where foul diseases and rottenness and works of corruption abound."[4]

The system of Empedocles is a grand pantheism of

[1] Theodoret, *Cur. Gr. App.* iv. 952. [2] Lucr. i. 717 sqq.
[3] Soph. p. 242 c. [4] Emped. *Carm.* 1–13, ed. Karsten, p. 85.

its kind. There was from eternity a world ever existing in peace within itself, where everything was found in perfect state, and the four elements of fire and water, earth and air, as the subtler elements of all, were harmoniously blended in and by the side of one another. This eternal, round-shaped world, the sphere, was conceived by Empedocles to be a being with a soul, thinking and divine, self-conscious of its own blissfulness, and revolving round itself; and therefore he further describes it as a holy will flying in swift thought the world through.[1] Next to the principle of love predominating in it, the sphere too contained *in posse* an opposite and counteracting fundamental power, that of hate; and to the active and reciprocal operations of the two, all that falls within the idea of becoming, of change, and of individual development and formation, is subject. As, then, hate grew up in the bosom of the sphere, it began its work of parting and separating the elements hitherto in accordant combination.[2] Thereupon came out love, striving for unity, to the encounter; and then was formed externally to the sphere, which continued in undisturbed harmony, and upon its upper surface, this visible world of change, of coming into being and ceasing to be, with hate for its special originator, just as Heraclitus makes war the father of all things; and thus also hate is the dominant principle in the present cycle of the world.[3] Love, personalised by Empedocles, is called Cypris, or Aphrodite, and hate Ares, the former being the good, the latter the evil, principle. Accordingly, the whole world of sense presented to him the aspect of a falling off and of imperfection, and yet, through the strength of love ever working in it, notwithstanding the contradictory power of hate has the upper hand, it retains an impulse and longing to return into the sphere; wherefore, as Aristotle has observed, hate in the system of Empedocles is as combinative and formative as love, and this, again, as disuniting and destructive as hate;[4] for without hate nothing external to the sphere would have come into form, and, from the impulse to

[1] Emp. *l.c.* v. 359–363.
[2] *Ibid. l.c.* v. 139 sqq.
[3] Aristot. *de Cœlo*, iii. 2. 301 A; Simplic. *Schol. in Aristot.* 507 A.
[4] *Metaph.* i. 3, ii. 4.

return thither, the operation of love is conversely disuniting, and a resolvent of the beings of the world of sense. Hence too, when once all things return again into the primitive state of the sphere, the complete demolition of this world would ensue therefrom,[1] in order to inaugurate the circle of rest afresh, in which hate first severs the elements from the unity of the sphere, and forms the multitudinous variety of things, whereupon love again brings back the separated elements into unity.[2]

Blessed spirits, gods and demons, inhabit the sphere from eternity, and these, if they allow hate power over them, and so stain themselves with guilt, come to be thrust out from this world of spirits, or torn asunder from it, and set out upon their migrations through earthly bodies, by becoming implicated in the great process of metamorphosis at work in the world of sense. In the "long-lived" deities of this world, in men, beasts, and even plants, there dwell gods and demons, forced or fallen from the sphere. Empedocles pictures in eloquent terms, from his own memory, the misery of fallen spirits, how they are hurled from one element into another, how the wrath of the ether casts them into the sea, and this again spews them upon the land; how thereupon earth tosses them up to the sun, and the sun launches them into the eddies of ether: thus one takes them from the other, yet each hates them in turn.[3] He himself had already been bird, shrub, and fish, young man and maiden. Noble souls pass after death into the bodies of the higher creatures, the lion, for instance, and the laurel-tree; the best become, on their last earthly migration, prophets, poets, physicians, and princes, in order to become gods at last, and after a perfect purification to enter again into a blissful life of eternal youth in the sphere.[4] As even the spirits nearest of kin when enclosed

[1] Emped. v. 138–153, Karsten; Plat. *Soph.* 242; Aristot. *Phys.* viii. 1. 250 B.

[2] Hippolyt. *adv. Hær.* pp. 247–251.

[3] Emp. v. 16 sqq., Karsten.

[4] An irreconcilable contradiction is here found by almost all modern expounders of the doctrine of Empedocles (Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, 2nd edit. i. 551; Steinhart in the *Encyl. of Halle*, vol. xxxiv. p. 103), on the ground of his deriving souls from the mere cohesion of corporeal matter, which therefore must necessarily be destroyed along with the dissolution of the body,

in strange bodies did not recognise one another here below, it came to pass that by putting animals to a painful death and eating them, the son sinned against the father, the children of her womb against their mother, for they fed on the flesh of their parents; and therefore the sparing of animal life, and abstinence from flesh-meat, became a sacred obligation.[1] If the philosopher did not extend this further to the vegetable world, he only abstained from so doing partly on the score of impossibility, partly on the hypothesis that, by the destruction of vegetable existence, the transition into a higher organism was rendered possible to the indwelling spirit. Empedocles also recommended abstinence from sexual intercourse and the procreation of children, in order not to contribute to the work of hate, and to be ever frustrating the unitive work of love by fresh dismemberments.[2]

A rude contrast to the daring and imaginative contemplations of the philosopher of Agrigentum was furnished by the jejune and purely materialist teaching of the Atomistic school, which went upon the principle of getting rid of the spirit as a motive principle, and of making any other power but that of matter superfluous. The head of this school was Democritus of Abdera, the most learned of all the old philosophers, and the greatest of naturalists before Aristotle. He was born 460 B.C., and lived nearly a century. It was he who brought to light the doctrine attributed to Leucippus, of whom but little is known. In conscious opposition to the Eleatic doctrine, this system admitted an infinite series of indivisible unities or atoms, which, being too small to be visible, and all specifically alike though infinitely distinct in form and space,[3] each to its own extent occupied space. To this atomic

while, on the other hand, he inculcates a soul surviving the death of the body, and migratory. This contradiction is solved if we adopt the threefold division which Empedocles makes of the spirit from the sphere, and the sensitive and understanding soul formed of the substance of the elements. That this was his view is clear from his expressions touching the double perceptive faculty in man. Connect his principle, "like can only be known by like," with the claim to a knowledge of the divine, and he must have acknowledged in man a still higher principle, and one descended from the sphere, besides the soul, composed of terrene matter, and only cognisant of the earthly by affinity.

[1] Emp. v. 410 sqq. K.

[2] Hippolyt. *l.c.* p. 251.

[3] Simplic. in. *Phys. f.* 106; Plut. *adv. Colot.* p. 1110.

mass, as sole principle of creation, all that has come into existence and actuality is to be referred. From their mere movement, taking place of itself *in vacuo*, by virtue of which, as Leucippus said, they were involved in a perpetual whirl, from their pressing and clashing together, in their various sizes and shapes, atomic aggregates were formed, as the only things in nature, and thus the world is the all and the sum of combined and co-ordinated atoms, whose combination was termed beginning-to-be, and whose solution ceasing-to-be. Every alteration which we observe is but a putting together, and division, a change of the relations of space between the atoms. In this process of world formation, as the motion of atoms is devoid of system and incalculable, blind chance dominates; yet still again the law of necessity recurs, for all depends unconditionally on the nature of atoms and their formations. Organic development, or regulated scale of motion, there is nowhere in the world, but only the caprice of chance employed in heaping atoms together. Democritus himself, however, was of opinion that chance here was nothing else than a makeshift of human ignorance; in itself there could only be question in the world of a law of necessity, which certainly was not capable of being fathomed.

The creed of Democritus was a complete unspiritualising of the world. The soul, according to it, is an aggregate of round fire-atoms, which, being continually renovated by respiration, penetrates and moves the visible and dense body, as a second and finer one. His conception of thinking was so material that, according to him, it was only when its warmth had reached the proper temperature that the soul could think rightly, but that, when over-warm or over-cold, its thoughts were unintelligent. All perception and knowledge — and the Atomist distinguished as little between the two as he did between life, soul, and spirit — was founded on contact, the medium being of this kind, that certain impressions or pictures of the atoms aggregate, seized in their course, remained fixed in the soul. Death was a falling into dust, or decomposition, of the fiery atoms of the soul and the more solid ones of the body, upon which the two proceed to unite themselves to other forms

with other atoms. The Atomists, though they could not allow the gods room for activity in the ordering of the world, yet did not think themselves obliged to deny their existence, and thought they too consisted of systems of round fiery-like atoms, which had attached themselves to finer, purer, and more durable bodies, endowed with gigantic proportion and higher energies. These deities became perceptible to men through the images (εἴδωλα) ever flowing down from them, the origin and nature of which Democritus explained just as he did in the case of all other creatures.[1] Terrific and extraordinary natural phenomena, which men referred to them as the authors, had established the notion that these beings were gods.[2]

It was beyond this stiff materialism that Anaxagoras of Clazomenæ resolutely soared. He was born about the year 500 B.C., and soon after the Persian wars came to Athens and taught there, until he was accused of atheism and obliged to abscond, dying at Lampsacus when he was seventy-two years old. He too would accept no beginning of existence and production in the world; the elements of the universe must have existed from eternity; hence the place occupied by atoms in the theory of Democritus was to be taken by *homœomeriæ* in his, with the exception that, in opposition to the Atomists, he adopted primitive qualities. There were, therefore, in the first chaotic state aforesaid countless elemental substances, infinitesimally small and accordingly invisible, or matter in the utmost variety of its conditions all huddled up one with the other without distinction. Free, however, of this confusion, above all sundered from everything material, and pure in itself, the Nous or Intelligence existed, the finest and simplest of all things, and to it belonged both to know and to act. This thing, conceived by Anaxagoras to be really material, first threw the chaotic motionless matter into a current of motion, and thereby effected that partial solution and severance of matter, from which the world derived the beginnings of form and order. Thus "Nous" is a self-moving intelligence, energising with intelligent ends, and of it all organic creatures, even the plants, have a share, its

[1] Plut. *Sympos.* viii. 10. 2; Plac. *Phil.* iv. 8.

[2] Sext. Emp. *adv. Phys.* ix. 19. 24: cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. p. 590.

appearance in different species in higher or lesser perfection being a condition of their particular organisation. The Nous, accordingly, is the world-soul, conceived of as a thinking disposer of the world, pursuing ends; and though Anaxagoras, so far as we know, avoided using the expression "God" of his "Nous," nevertheless others after him did employ it.[1]

So important was the advance involved in this doctrine of Anaxagoras of the spirit penetrating and moulding the mass of matter, that Aristotle says he appears like a person of reflection in comparison with those who had previously spoken without any.[2] Another of the ancients[3] observed of him that he was the first not to rank chance, or indeed fate, as influential principles of direction in the universe, but pure intelligence. Chance, the wise man of Clazomenæ taught, was a fact hidden to human perception; fate, an empty name.[4] In opposition to Empedocles, he conceived nothing unintelligent or disorderly found place in nature.[5] As the system of Anaxagoras was dualistic, and the Nous not the primal principle of all being, but only a being by the side of eternal matter, which it penetrated, formed, and dominated, he would have referred the evil in the world to the defectiveness of matter, never fully to be overcome; though there is no distinct testimony to this effect. As to the human soul, he adopted the idea that it lost its individuality after death and returned into the world-soul. His teaching gave the Greeks great offence, particularly his "book of Nature," which was filled with expressions savouring of impiety. In it he refused to acknowledge a divine being in the powers of nature, which were honoured as deities, and amongst them to Helios even; and the sun he explained to be a mass of stone in a state of glowing heat.[6] This is why Lucian makes Zeus say he had lately been hurling his bolts on the head of Anaxagoras the Sophist, "who announced to his followers that we, the gods, don't exist at all."[7]

[1] Anaxag. *Fragm.* 1–25, ed. Schaubach, pp. 65–145.
[2] Plut. *Pericl.* iv.: cf. Aristot. *Metaph.* i. 3.
[3] Plat. *Phileb.* p. 28.
[4] Plut. *de Plac. Phil.* i. 29; Stob. *Ecl. Phys.* i. p. 218.
[5] Themist. in *Aristot. Phys. f.* 58 B.
[6] Diog. Laert. ii. 8.
[7] Lucian, *Timon*, 10.

The fifth century before Christ, and particularly the time from the Persian wars till the termination of the Peloponnesian, a period embracing the lives of three almost contemporaries, Euripides, Socrates, and Thucydides (480–400), was a brilliant one for the Greek people, and one of the highest development of all the intellectual powers that dwelt in this richly favoured branch of pre-Christian humanity. What Hellas then was in comparison with the rest of the world, the same was Athens for Hellas, "the Prytaneum of Greek wisdom," [1] with a power of attraction so strong, that nearly all who were conscious of intellectual superiority, from the most distant countries and cities, repaired thither with the certainty of finding on the spot a fitting sphere of operation, and scholars eager to be taught.

The men at that time working at Athens with the greatest success as teachers of rhetoric and of a popular philosophy calculated for active life and the exigencies of the moment, and who, as the people's instructors, supplied the place of the earlier poets and rhapsodists, were generally called Sophists. Their special object was to train young men to play a useful part in public affairs and the administration of the republic. Gorgias, Protagoras, Prodicus, and others, as they passed from city to city, earned themselves fame and wealth throughout the whole of Greece, and became the famous men of their day, by their endeavours to popularise the stores of knowledge, which had been treated more esoterically by previous inquirers, and by their having an answer at hand to every question equally, and a speech to make on every conceivable subject, —an offer made in terms by Hippias. They did not form a philosophical school of their own, and had no community of doctrine; every one went his own way independent of the other; generally they had no more in common one with the other than was required by the similarity of their pursuits and of the wants they undertook to satisfy. The thing which earned them numerous scholars and admirers was not so much the novelty of their speculations as their rhetorical readiness, the ease with which they understood making themselves substantially masters of every kind of

[1] Plat. *Protag.* p. 337.

subject, and a boldness of assertion hitherto strange to the ears and minds of their fellow-men. On the whole, a sceptical tendency was a necessary consequence of their influence on a people whose intellect was principally formed by reading mythological poems, above all in Athens, where frequent contact with strangers made them more alive to the variations and internal contradictions of the pagan religious system than to what they held in common.

Plato and Aristotle have attached to the name Sophist, which many at that time considered an honourable distinction, the notion of a mode of teaching and speculation at once superficial and unfair. The first, in particular, describes them as a society of arrogant and wrangling pretenders to knowledge; as rhetoricians who, in their artificial dissertations upon the objects of the moral and natural world, only spread wider the apparent and the illusive; as men whose highest aim was the applause and favour of the multitude, and who were calculating and unprincipled accordingly, their skill consisting in clothing good and evil, true and false, in the garb of fine-sounding words and phrases of easy flow. And yet Plato has undertaken in person the defence of these Sophists against the reproach, still lying at their door, of having been the real perverters of the Greek youth. "It is not they," he said,[1] "who should be responsible for the views insinuated into the minds of youth, but the people itself, with its tyrannical opinions, as manifested in the assemblies, courts of justice, theatres, and elsewhere; the Sophists merely taught what was adapted to this dominant tone, nothing better or worse."

Protagoras of Abdera (480–410 B.C.) passed for the wisest of the Sophists, and was at Athens held in high estimation by Pericles. As follower of Heraclitus, he accepted a perpetual flux of all things, a continual "becoming," even in man's intellectual perceptions. By his far-famed saying that man was the measure of all things, he intended to express this, that to man that only was true which appeared to him at each moment so; and, so far as his notions went, knowledge lay only in perception, and two opposite judgments might be equally authoritative upon the very same subject, precisely according to the

[1] Plat. *Rep.* vi. p. 492.

sensations on which they were founded. His book upon the gods, which drew an indictment upon him at Athens, began with these words: "Of the gods I know nothing, neither whether they be nor whether they be not; for there is much that stands in the way of knowledge here, as well the obscurity of the matter as the shortness of human life." [1]

As Protagoras had grown out of the school of Heraclitus, so his contemporary, Gorgias of Leontium (496–400 B.C.), the most famous orator of his century, derived his views from the Eleatic doctrine, on the strength of which he essayed to prove in his work upon the non-existing, or Nature, that nothing, in fact, really existed; or if anything did, it was nevertheless not cognisable; or if cognisable, then not communicable.[2] He agreed, that is, with the Eleatics, so far as they explained all coming into being, and all motion, as an illusion of the senses, and at the same time denied generally the existence of the individual and the contingent; while, on the other hand, he thought their one, everlasting, and immutable being an empty abstraction.

The proverbial wisdom of Prodicus of Ceos was done homage to by Socrates himself, who called him his friend and master. Prodicus, however, survived him. But even he declared the whole world of gods to be an invention of human egotism: all that is in nature, whatever proves beneficent and useful to man,—sun, moon, rivers, fountains, bread, wine,—that they have converted into gods and prayed to.[3] Hence Sextus, and Cicero as well, reckons him one of the Atheists. Critias, the cleverest of the thirty Tyrants, and famous as philosopher and statesman, earned himself the same designation. The gods, he thought, were an invention of the old lawgivers, with the view that men, being afraid of punishment from them, might spare one another.[4] Materialism and Atheism now went hand in hand. While Critias placed the soul of man in the blood, the Sophist Antiphon (probably the same who was put to death in Athens by the thirty Tyrants), in his system of natural philosophy, made an unconscious nature

[1] Diog. Laert. ix. 52; Sext. Emp. *adv. Phys.* ix. 56 sqq.
[2] Aristot. *de Xenophane, Zenone, et Gorgia*, c. 5, 6.
[3] Sext. Emp. *adv. Phys.* ix. 52; Cic. *N. D.* i. 42.
[4] Sext. Emp. *adv. Phys.* ix. 54.

power, which at the same time was matter, produce all things by means of corruption. Another contemporary, Œnopides the Pythagorean, degraded the godhead to a mere world-soul, and recognised in fire and air the principle of all things.[1] Of a still more decided materialist character, to all appearance, was the system of Hippo of Rhegium, who also lived at Athens, for there the comic poet, Cratinus, ridiculed him. He, like Thales, took moisture to be the one fundamental principle of all things, in accordance with which he spoke of the soul as being a watery substance.[2] Archelaus of Miletus, too, who taught in Athens, and even counted Socrates amongst his disciples, had turned back again from the dualism of his master, Anaxagoras, to the adoption of one single primal being, and was an acknowledged materialist, inasmuch as he gave out the spirit that framed the world to be a thing of air, within which a contest between a warm and active, and a cold and inactive element took place.[3]

And yet this same Athens, in the heart of which for a space of twenty-five years almost all these men unfolded their views, had the credit of being the most religious city of the whole of Hellas, and the most zealous in the service of the gods; and every Athenian was convinced that the praise which Sophocles put into the mouth of his Œdipus was still their due:

> "With you alone on earth I found religious sense,
> And mercy mild, and lips unstained by foul deceit."

Higher and higher was Athens exalted by people from all quarters, as a perfect pattern to the rest of Greece of reverence for the gods and religious earnestness. A strong reaction against this invasion of the philosophy of irreligion could not but take place accordingly. The comic poets, who certainly allowed themselves a free rein in ridiculing the gods, shot their arrows from the stage at the philosophers. In his *Clouds*, Aristophanes, aiming at Anaxagoras, introduced the Eddy-god "Dinos," who, as then reigning god of the world, had put down Zeus and

[1] Stob. *Ecl. Phys.* i. 2. 29; Diog. Laert. ix. 37. 41.
[2] Aristot. *Metaph.* i. 3; *De Animâ*, i. 2.
[3] Hippolyt. *adv. Hær.* pp. 15, 16, 20.

the rest.[1] Then in Athens, too, there was no lack of severity, and many single blows were dealt at Philosopher and Sophist. Already Anaxagoras, under a charge of atheism, had only escaped with his life through the powerful protection of Pericles. The condemnations of Protagoras and Diagoras of Melos were not long in following. The first escaped by flight the execution of the sentence of death passed upon him, but was drowned in crossing the sea:[2] his writings were burnt, and all who possessed copies of them were required by public proclamation to surrender them. Diagoras, a disciple of the Atomists, had mentioned, in his *Phrygian Discourses*, the Eleusinian and Samothracian mysteries, without regard to the seal of secrecy, probably to use their contents in his physical solution of the gods. For this offence he was denounced as an atheist, and a decree of the people, engraved on a brass column, proclaimed a reward of a talent to any one who killed him, or of two to the man who should bring him alive to Athens.[3] Prodicus too, according to one account, suffered the punishment of death on the charge of corrupting youth at Athens:[4] and even the greatest and worthiest of her sons, the man whom every Athenian should have been proud to have for his fellow-citizen, and whose life had specially been devoted to the task of encountering irreligious philosophy, met with the same fate.

Socrates the sculptor, founder of the Attic philosophy, was, like the rest, a Sophist, according to the Athenian use of the term; for every one at that time was so styled who engaged in philosophical speculations, and made the propagation of his views by public exposition or lecture the business of his life. Readily devoting his energies to youth, as they did, he often entered into conversation and the war of words with the other Sophists: and was even brought up on the stage by Aristophanes as the model representative of the species. And yet there was a wide gulf separating him from all the others, even the best of the lot; and his influence had a much stronger hold on the

[1] *Nub.* 380, 826, 1241, 1471, 1477.
[2] Sext. Emp. *adv. Phys.* ix. 56.
[3] Diod. xiii. 6; Aristoph. *Av.* 1073, and Scholiast, *ib.* [4] Suidas, *s.v.*

intellectual life in general of that day: for the whole *personnel* of the man had something out of the common and remarkable in it. There was no one to compare him with, was the thought that struck his contemporaries, and people felt the effects of his society as that of an irresistible enchanter. The turn he had for imparting himself to every one on every opportunity, his ready will, nay eagerness to engage in single combat with the first and best disputants, joined with the rare gifts of making himself understood by all, great and simple, in their ordinary forms of speech; of developing the germs of investigation and proof in them, while entangling them by concessions, the consequences of which they never dreamed of; the artistic power of well-weighed dialectic with which he destroyed unreal knowledge; an ironical instinct, drawing everything into the grasp of his own dissecting process of thought, while simultaneously undeceiving himself and others;—all this contributed to make him a vision of wonder past imitation, and a deep and lasting mover of souls. One can understand how he came to be reverenced by some as a being of a higher order, a genius veiled in the exterior of a Silenus, and by others dreaded, nay even hated; as also how Aristophanes could discern in him an enemy of the old discipline and morals, a subtiliser dangerous to youth and throwing doubt on everything, the teacher of a cosmopolitism politically ruinous; and how he could enter into the encounter with him as such, and turn his own weapons against him.

Antiquity betimes distinguished Socrates as the founder of ethics, and the one man who enriched the demesne of inquiry, hitherto confined to physics or natural philosophy, with the new and as yet unformed province of ethics;[1] and it is a well-known dictum of Cicero that it was he who brought down philosophy from heaven to earth, introducing her into private houses and public squares, and the daily life of mankind.[2] Socrates himself believed he pursued the vocation he had chosen under a special inspiration of the deity. From the time the oracle at Delphi answered his disciple Chærephon, that no one on earth was wiser than Socrates, he considered himself as a missionary consecrated

[1] Diog. Laert. iii. 56.

[2] Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* v. 4.

to the service of the deity, and his exertions in teaching as obedience to that divine voice.

Xenophon's assertion,[1] that his master discountenanced all investigation of nature as a thing unattainable, is to be limited thus much, that in so doing Socrates was expressing a general warning against studies of the kind, with a view to the atheistic physics of the period, and the practical requirements of young men. He had himself in his younger days pursued the study of nature with ardour,[2] and, after the Ionic philosophy left him dissatisfied, had rejoiced to find in Anaxagoras the doctrine of an all-disposing Intelligence, though he still had to complain of him as not having the wit to make further use of his principle. As he penetrated further, however, it seemed to him good to go on employing himself in the knowledge of himself, and to descend deeper and deeper into the abyss of self-consciousness. In so doing he had throughout no intention of putting himself at the head of a school; he had, he said, no newly found store of wisdom to proffer, nor had he ever taught any one anything in its real sense; he had only intended to practise in intellectual midwifery, and to be a signpost pointing the road for all to arrive at the knowledge they were so wanting in, and which yet was so necessary, by energising with their own intellects.

It was the doctrine of Socrates that all virtue rests on knowledge, as well as that evil has its only root in defect of knowledge, or in error; and wherever only the true knowledge is to be found, there is it ever victorious over all affections and attractions to evil. Hence the effort to become better is nothing else but the untiring endeavour to undeceive oneself. So completely were the ideas of philosophy and virtue blended with him, that he unhesitatingly asserted all that is done with knowledge to be good, and no man with knowledge to be bad. But if one asks what were the subjects he would assign to this knowledge, and what was the bond he would have uniting all virtues, and even to be identical with virtue herself, we may with confidence appeal to the consistent representation of Xenophon, as it is fully borne out by the Platonic dialogue *Protagoras*,

[1] *Memor.* iv. 7. 6. [2] Plat. *Phæd.* p. 96.

one of those in which the Socrates of history is portrayed in his truest colours.

Now, according to that statement, the foundation of the Socratic ethics is an eudemonistic one; his "knowing" is an acquaintance with the truly useful and agreeable. There was no supreme good for him in general as THE moral ideal, having its object in itself, but only a good of a relative kind, directing itself by, and coincident with, the profitable of the moment, and the pleasure arising from the sentiment of the agreeable. Moral action consisted in a searching and calculating selection of the more useful or more agreeable. Wisdom and virtue should accordingly externate themselves in the scales, and by the measure of greater or less pleasure or pain, only possible through the medium of an accurate knowledge of the objects awakening these sensations in us; so then even the sinner is only in defect from not knowing the better, allowing himself, that is, to be seduced by the less agreeable, or that which is but apparently and superficially agreeable.[1]

It is honourable to the character of Socrates, that from these premises he should have deduced lessons of sobriety and self-conquest, and that so his life, and particularly its glorious close, proved the practical corrective of what was wanting in his theory. His position that the deity only was wise, and that human wisdom was little or nothing worth in comparison with divine, might have carried him a long way further;[2] much depends too on the sense he attached to another expression reported by Xenophon,[3] that the human soul partook of the divine. Was his meaning that which his disciple Plato put upon it, namely, that the one divine soul caused the multiplicity of individual souls to issue from the one divine soul by emanation or communication of essence?[4] In that case, the idea Plato had already brought out in one of his earliest dialogues,[5] that the true self-knowledge consists in the insight of the intelligence into its own purest and divine essence, should clearly be ascribed to Socrates. Only once in the remaining sources of Socratic doctrine do scanty hints on this important point

[1] Xenoph. *Memor.* iv. 6. 8, 1. 5, 3. 12, and *passim*; Plat. *Protag.* 355.
[2] Plat. *Apol.* p. 23.
[3] *Mem.* iv. 3. 14.
[4] *Phædr.* pp. 245, 246.
[5] *Alcib.* 1.

appear; and yet if he had really worked out the thought of the "human soul's partaking in the divine," the influence of it upon his other views must necessarily have been considerable.[1]

The terms, "the divine, god, the gods, the demonic, the intelligence dwelling in the universe," are equivalent with Socrates; but the generality of his expressions concerning religion bear a popular colouring that accommodates itself to the ordinary run of ideas; and if it is said of him, that his principal aim was to instruct those about him in the knowledge of the gods, then such instructions turned partly upon the existence of the gods,[2] in which he appealed to the general belief of mankind in opposition to the unbelievers, and partly upon the practical side of reverence to the gods. We ought, he declared, to give up the idea of an acquaintance with the deity in itself, but to recognise it in its works as a providence governing the world according to free will.[3] And this providence—an idea first current among the Greeks through Socrates and Plato—becomes more concrete with him, after he has once distinguished from the other deities the God who orders and holds together the whole world.[4] But this one supreme God, who certainly was different from the Zeus of Hellenic popular belief, was not firmly grasped by him, at least in communication with others; the gods of the popular religion are more frequently in his mouth; and if he ascribes omniscience and omnipresence to them,[5] yet he does not really seem to have been conscious of the contradiction in which the extension of his theory of god to the host of popular gods involved him. He instructed his disciples to ask nothing by prayer of the gods, except only the good generally, as they, the gods, best knew themselves what was good for man; also that it was not the most costly sacrifices they preferred, but those that came from religious hearts. Just as he saw duty summed up in obedience to the laws of the

[1] Cicero, indeed, asserts quite the contrary (*de Amic.* iv. 13). Socrates consistently taught that the souls of men were divine, and that the road back to heaven was open to them on their separation from the body. If we could be certain of Cicero's having had, not the passages of Plato, but expressions of the elder Socraticians before his eyes, the question would be decided.

[2] Xen. *Mem.* iv. 3. 2.

[3] Xen. *Symp.* c. 6. 7.

[4] Xen. *Mem.* iv. 3. 13: comp. i. 4. 5. 7.

[5] *Mem.* i. 1. 19.

state, he also declared the knowing of the gods according to the law of each particular state to be the best worship of them ;[1] and the *Apology* of Xenophon alleges in his defence that he had neither offered sacrifice to certain other deities than Zeus, Hera, and their fellow-gods, nor sworn by, nor believed in, others.[2] Alcibiades testifies to his having prayed at sunrise,[3] "and with truth could Socrates reject the accusation of having robbed the sun of divine honour after the fashion of Anaxagoras, and degraded him to a dead mass of fire": he himself thought this an absurd idea.[4]

This holding of Socrates with the popular religion extended also to the whole province of divination. He took it to be an axiom, that the gods made known their will regarding the future to the Hellenes by oracles and prodigies: only he recommended that the gods should not be importuned about things which admitted of being known either by private investigation or by the employment of natural means; and yet he himself advised Xenophon to consult the Delphic oracle on taking part in the mercenary force of the expedition against Persia. What later writers have termed the Demon or Genius of Socrates was an interior voice perceptible to him from his youth, or a strong sudden feeling, which manifested itself either by way of warning or deterring him, but never urging him to anything. He himself did not personify this prodigy as his genius; he only called it a thing demonic, that is, extraordinary or inexplicable, to which he paid implicit obedience, and of which he spoke, without any reserve, as a well-known occurrence, and in the playful manner usual with him. This interior monitor only regarded his personal conduct, and amongst other things forbade his meddling in political matters.[5]

If Socrates, a grey-headed man of seventy, at the end of a long career of more than thirty years, is condemned to death, and obliged to drink the cup of poison, it is in the main but a feeling of astonishment that is aroused in the

[1] *Mem.* i. 3. 1, iv. 3. 16.
[2] Xen. *Apol.* 24.
[3] Plat. *Sympos.* p. 220.
[4] Plat. *Apol.* p. 26.
[5] *Ibid.* 31; *Theætet.* 151; *Phædr.* 242; *Rep.* vi. 406 (?); Xen. *Mem.* i. 1. 4, iv. 8. 5.

mind that such a fate had not overtaken him earlier. As many as twenty-four years previously Aristophanes had held him up to the public hatred, as a Sophist that led youth astray, to the destruction of religion, state, and family; and of personal enemies he could have had no lack, from the unsparing way in which he dealt around the keen darts of his irony, and his dialectics in question and answer, stripping even the most influential personages of the plumes of false science which they prided themselves in. True, he was, every inch of him, a genuine Greek and Athenian, nevertheless he went far beyond the limits of nationality in his aspirations after a cosmopolite ideal. Justice indeed with him was essentially one with legal observance; and in his view the rightful or the legal, which was to be every one's rule and standard of conduct, rested in part on the common and written divine law, and in part on the positive human decrees and ordinances of each particular state. Before these bounds, he thought, every one should stop, and against them allow no use of the right of examination and scrutiny, so urgently recommended in other parts. The effects of his principles and method, however, extended beyond the limits drawn by him, and they were not only mere personal enemies who clearly recognised or instinctively felt that his teaching was at heart irreconcilable with the whole existing political system and the ideas prevalent thereon. In democratical Athens, where each view that, for the moment, won a majority of voices could at once pass into act by legislation, and where, too, the strength of the fence around the traditional and the customary, and their sacredness, formed the only bulwark against the waves of an almost unbridled and omnipotent democracy,—in such a state as this, the general process of testing recommended by Socrates, his method of dissecting the fundamental principles of ethics and politics, and decomposing them into their simplest elements, must needs have appeared a very dangerous task indeed; the younger people he trained were continually discovering contradictions and mistakes in the existing arrangements and established notions of state, religion, justice, and virtue, and it was not to be expected in any way that the veneration ordinarily prescribed them by their master for laws *in esse* would induce

sovereign members of a democratic polity to abstain from using the insight they had gained whenever they began to take part in legislation. Besides, in the case of Alcibiades and Critias, people had already seen and tasted the fruits of the Socratic schooling.

The charge against Socrates ran thus: "He does not believe in the state deities, is introducing new ones, and besides is perverting youth to disobedience to parents and to the state laws." It is observable that the accused did not simply deny the imputation of non-belief in the state gods; indeed, according to Xenophon's representation, he must have appealed to his own taking part in religious rites and sacrifices; while in the *Apology* of Plato, by a question addressed to him, he first makes his accuser Meletus say that Socrates did not believe in the gods in general; whereupon, evading the specific in the charge, he meets it with a flat denial. The accusation of his introducing new divine beings had reference to his "daimonion," or interior warning voice, which did not desert him even in these last moments of his life. He certainly looked upon this as a gift specially imparted to him by particular favour of the deity, but assuredly he had no thought therein of any new or strange deity. This appeal to an internal oracle of the kind, for which no analogy was to be found in pagan life, or in the customary methods of consulting the gods, must have always had an offensive appearance in the eyes of the people; it is all the more striking that Socrates should have made so very weak and evasive an answer on this head, and only attempted, by a play upon the word "demonic," to entangle his accuser in a contradiction. On the other hand, he determinedly repels the accusation of being addicted to the atheistical physics of Anaxagoras.[1] There were still two charges, which must have weighed heavily against him before such judges,—that he had found fault with the democratical form of government, and in particular had stigmatised election by lot to offices of state as absurd; and, in fine, that the hated tyrant Critias had come out of his school. This last, according to the statement of Æschines, proved the proximate occasion of his death.

[1] Plat. *Apol.* p. 26.

Next to that, however, it was himself who invoked the doom upon his own head by the high tone of his defence, by his refusal to fix the measure of punishment to be awarded himself, and by his own declaration that he would not obey the mandate of the state forbidding him to propagate his doctrines. Upon this, eighty of his judges, who before declared themselves in favour of his innocence, now agreed in voting for his death. He made good use of the respite of thirty days allowed him till the execution of the sentence, on account of the sacrificial embassy to Delos, tracing his doctrines in indelible characters upon the hearts of his disciples, whilst he spurned to save himself by flight, and looked death in the face with indomitable composure and cheerfulness. This conclusion of his life is the sublimest and noblest scene the pre-christian period of paganism has to point to. A comparison has been made between the close of his life and the sacrificial death of an infinitely higher Being; but assuredly this should never have been attempted at all, were it only for the reason that the points of difference and contrast in the two events are of far stronger and deeper grain than the features of resemblance lying merely on the surface.

DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AMONG THE GREEKS UP TO THE DEATH OF SOCRATES—RELIGIOUS ASPECT OF THE LEADERS OF GREEK LITERATURE—SOME OF THEIR MORE IMPORTANT RELIGIOUS IDEAS AND DOCTRINES

Before we consider the Greek philosophy and its relations to religion at its culminating point under Plato and Aristotle, it is worth while to take a general view of intellectual cultivation among the Greeks, and its development on the religious side, up to the death of Socrates. It is the coryphaei of Hellenic literature that occur in this period, so far as the religious views and modes of thought among their contemporaries are reflected in them, or have been determined by them: it is some of the more important ideas and doctrines, the growth and apprehension of which furnishes a standard by which to estimate the

religious sentiments and life of a period and a people, that we have now to contemplate.

After the Greeks gave up adding new creations to their masses of legendary lore, both their meaning and the understanding of them had also been gradually disappearing. So far as any one undertook to put down in black and white, to collect and sift this motley chaos of legends, there were everywhere discovered insoluble contradictions, and a vagueness which eluded every effort to detect and keep hold of anything substantial and of general acceptance. From the sixth century B.C., and in some degree from a still earlier period, the more trouble that was taken with the collection and putting together of mythical materials, the more evident it was that there was nothing to be met with but the *débris* of an older tradition, the scattered stones of an edifice whose foundations and elevation could no more be determined, and that later artificial combinations had already in many instances got the upper hand here. The efforts, zealously maintained, to remedy the evil by allegorical interpretations of the Homeric and Hesiodic poems, betray the complete loss of the key to the true sense of the myths, and also the keenness of the feeling about all that was offensive and unworthy of gods in the myths, which was partly owing to that loss.

As early as the year 520 B.C., Theagenes of Rhegium came out with his assertion, that besides the literal sense of the words in the Homeric and Hesiodic writings, there was also a hidden and internal one to be taken, divinable by man; and he carried out his view in an allegorical interpretation of the quarrel of the gods in the *Iliad*.[1] Heraclitus expressed himself indignantly about "atheists," who took offence at the Homeric story of Zeus having suspended Hera between heaven and earth, which was to be understood allegorically of the formation of the universe and the elements.[2] This allegorico-physical interpretation of the Greek deities was at length completely systematised by Metrodorus of Lampsacus, a follower of Anaxagoras: all the gods were elemental bodies and physical parts of the universe, and thereby the mythical adventures of the gods and the offensive parts of the divine legends were

[1] Schol. *Iliad.* xx. 67; Tatian, *adv. Gr.* c. 48. [2] Schol. *Iliad.* xv. 18.

resolved into pure physical facts and natural phenomena.[1] Homer, the common religious book of the Greeks, was compelled to supply the text even here, and Metrodorus extended his method to the very heroes of the *Iliad* throughout, whom he in like manner converted into physical powers and combinations of the elements. After him, this mode of interpretation became a favourite method of clearing away difficulties and protecting the poets against invectives; and so the popular superstition came to be charged with having held these poetical imaginings to be gods personified. Plato, however, by whose time this line of interpretation was widely spread, strongly disapproved of it. He was of opinion that, in a well-ordered state, the histories of the battles of the gods, of Hera's captivity, of the pushing Hephaistos down from heaven, and the like, should neither be admitted "with allegorical explanation nor without."[2] According to his view, the myths of the gods had only to be purged of all that was undignified and morally hurtful; otherwise he seems to have considered them as a foundation, to Greeks indispensable, of belief in the gods, and one which could not be made up for by any substitute. It is another question indeed how much of the entire mythic matter would have been left after being subjected to the extensive process of purification suggested by Plato, whose contemporary, Isocrates, seems to have cherished the like notion; for he inveighs bitterly against the poets who had attributed evil and immoral actions to the gods, and he assures us that many of them had been punished for such blasphemies with blindness, poverty, exile, and other inflictions.[3]

The repugnance felt by philosophers and many orators and statesmen to the vulgar poetical mythology was not merely on account of the disgraceful conceptions of the gods therein propagated; in reality they were much more deeply moved by observing what constant progress would be made by these stories in the palliation of worse sins and immoralities of deeper dye, as well in individuals as in entire communities. Plato's remark[4] on the myth of the

[1] Diog. Laert. ii. 11; Tatian, *adv. Gr.* c. 37.

[2] *Rep.* ii. p. 378.

[3] Isocr. *Or.* xi. p. 309, Bekker.

[4] *Legg.* i. p. 636. No one who weighs well the unmistakable words of

rape of Ganymede was, "All the world lays the burden of this tradition upon the Cretans, and holds them to be the inventors of it; and as the belief was general that their laws were from Zeus, they did not fail to lay this myth at his door, in order to have a precedent in the god, in accordance with which they might perpetrate this abomination." Now general rumour only attributed the invention of that myth to the Cretans, because people held them to be the originators of the vice in question, which spread from them first over the whole of Hellas. According to a Samian myth, Zeus and Hera lived secretly together in unmarried love for three hundred years; and to that myth they appealed to justify the custom allowing carnal intercourse between lovers before marriage.[1] In the Euthyphro of Plato one of the characters is represented as intending to bring his father before a court of justice, and deeming it a praiseworthy and pious act to do the same as Zeus had done before him to his father Cronos, and he again to Ouranos. It was an acknowledged fact that the gods seduced men into perjury, which was considered almost the worst sin of all, in order to carry their own decrees into execution; and in Æschylus it is said, "to righteous fraud not even the god is alien." As the myth regarding Hermes put that god in the light of the special patron and protector of perjury, imposture, and thieving, Plato accordingly found it necessary to certify that none of the sons of Zeus had ever taken delight in deceit or violence, or had recourse to either; and he goes on to add, "and therefore no one should allow himself to be led astray by poet or mythologist, to wicked and deceitful notions about the like transgressions, or fancy that when he steals or plunders he does nothing he need be ashamed of, but only what the gods themselves have done."[2] That the great thinker should have been obliged so strongly to insist upon this is a proof how widely these ideas were still current.

Meanwhile, so long as heathendom existed, there was

Ephorus, *ap. Strab.* x. p. 730, the testimony of Plato in the above passage, that of Aristotle, *Polit.* ii. 7. 5, and many other ancient writers, will believe that the relation of paiderastia, as sanctioned by law in Crete and described by Ephorus, was, for a time, a pure one, as Otfr. Müller (*Dorier*, ii. 194) and Höck (*Kreta*, iii. 113) labour to make out.

[1] Porphyr. et Eustath. *ad. Iliad.* xiv. 296.

[2] *Legg.* xii. p. 941.

a dormant belief among the people in the historico-literal sense and the truth of the myths. From its first dawn of consciousness a Greek's intellect was fed upon myths, and his thoughts ran in the type of the myth. To subject this labyrinth of myths to examination, and so to reject some and retain others, would have been a task as troublesome as it was impossible for the generality. It was a matter of such general acceptation in the time of Socrates, that the gods had begotten sons in physical intercourse with mortal women, that, on his trial, he rested his defence against his accuser Meletus upon it.[1] And the Greeks were still prepared in some cases to believe that such filiations were always taking place. The hero Astrabacus passed as the father of the Lacedæmonian king Demaratus in the time of the Persian war,[2] as Plato did with his admirers for a real son of Apollo; and the story ran that Aristo, his mother Perictione's husband, had been warned in a dream not to approach her until she had brought forth the son she had conceived of that god.[3] It was exactly the same in Sparta. Even the circumstance of Lysander having been able to employ a pretended son of Apollo as a tool for the attainment of his ambitious views, is a proof how matters stood there with the popular belief at so late a period as a century after Demaratus; and if many doubted the fact, assuredly there were plenty of believers.[4]

On turning to the intellectual coryphæi in poetry and history, Pindar is the first to meet us, his zenith falling in the period of the Persian wars. As minstrel of the games solemnised to the honour of the gods, and of the victories there won, he was directed by his subject, as well as by inclination and intellectual bias, to refer all details of life to the gods. Strikingly as this serves to impart an earnest religious colouring to the whole of his poetry, nevertheless he allowed himself to indulge in great freedom with the myths, some of which he handled with critical severity; of others he asserted that, from the first, they had been disfigured with an evil intention,[5] and that their many-coloured garb of falsehood led men astray; and one sees

[1] Plat. *Apol. Socr.* p. 15.
[2] Herodot. vi. 69.
[3] Diog. Laert. iii. 2; Plut. *Quæst. Sympos.* p. 717; Origen, *adv. Cels.* i. p. 29.
[4] Plut. *Lys.* 26.
[5] *Olymp.* i. 47–54.

too how his moral perceptions have been blemished by the multitude of these myths.

At the head of his age, and with his powers of vision purified and enlarged by exact knowledge of foreign people and customs, stood Pindar's contemporary, the historian Herodotus. With a wavering resolution he accepted the mythical basis of Greek history as a believer, and the divine descent of the Greek dynastic races is a fact with him. At the same time he calls some of the myths to critical account; for example, the miracle of Dodona. The historical sense is often stronger in him than religious belief, and his knowledge of nature prevented his considering an earthquake as entirely the art of Poseidon. Nevertheless Herodotus is a theological historian, who, in every step he takes, sees the power of the deity over the affairs of man, is as credulous as ever one of the people could be, and discovers in the oracles undoubted manifestations of the divine will. Though entirely devoted to the national gods, he frequently expresses himself as a monotheist,[1] following therein, without clearly knowing why, the track of his intellect, which led him on to a unity in the divine government of the world. But while the gods are in his eyes defective and limited beings, themselves subjected again to the higher power of destiny, they appear to him at the same time in the light of jealous powers, who, not partaking themselves in the full cup of perfect bliss, have no desire for man's attaining a high degree of happiness, and persecute, not the arrogant only, but the innocent also when too fortunate.[2] This view of the jealousy of the gods is in no way to be confused with their Nemesis, and was widely spread amongst the Greeks. Hence Plato after him, later still Plutarch, both argue against it.

If in Herodotus generally the jealousy or revenge of the "daimonion" appears as the great spring of worldly events and cause of decisive catastrophes, Thucydides, his junior by about a generation, enlarges considerably the sphere of human spontaneity and human motives, while he

[1] The most striking passage is in i. 31, where Hera is the goddess in question; and yet the historian says, "the god intended to show that death is the best thing for man."

[2] Her. i. 32, iii. 40.

lessens as much the part left to the gods to play in history. But though as a disciple of Anaxagoras he was, like him, styled an atheist,[1] yet he too acknowledged a supreme direction of human destiny by the deity. Accordingly, the inevitable ruin of the Athenian republic is something "demonic"[2] in his eyes, and he considers the decline of the fear of God as the worst consequence of the plague at Athens.[3]

An instructive contrast with these Ionians is presented to us in the Doro-Sicilian poet Epicharmus, who flourished from 478 to 467 B.C. Initiated by Arkesas, a scholar of Pythagoras, in the doctrines of that school, he put forward, under a poetical dress, in his comedies, Pythagorean views upon the deity, the world, and the soul of man. His theology was entirely of the physical cast; winds, water, earth, sun, fire, and stars were his gods, as Menander says.[4] He did not make the intelligent world-soul reside in a supreme being, but he made it impart itself to all living things, which were still involved in a perpetual flux; and the soul, that had flowed from the sun-fire, he let return to its native source, through the separation of physical and spiritual matter caused by death.[5] But Epicharmus also took pleasure in treating the gods' histories with comic effect in his plays: the detention of Hera on an enchanted seat by Hephæstos was represented in one of them; Hephæstos is exiled from Olympus for it, and is then made drunk by Dionysos and set upon an ass, and so returns, amid the boisterous din of his pot-companions, to the abode of the gods. Add to this—according to a somewhat late testimony, it is true[6]—that the sayings of the sententious poet were in the mouth of every philosopher; and we have a proof how high his intellectual influence is to be estimated, and how great must have been the number of those into whose ear and heart the "clever Sicilian" (as Cicero styles him) had whispered his choice and favourite sentiment, "Be temperate, and believe nothing."[7]

[1] Marcell. *Vit. Thuc.* 22. [2] Thuc. ii. 64. [3] *Ibid.* ii. 52 sqq.
[4] Menand. *Incert. Fab.* 10; Diog. Laert. iii. 16.
[5] Ennius, *Fragm. ex Epicharmo*, pp. 170–183, Hessel.
[6] Jamblich. *Vita Pyth.* xxix. 166.
[7] Cic. *Ep. ad Att.* i. 19; Clem. Al. *Strom.* v. p. 258.

The license of the poetry of the comic drama went still greater lengths at Athens than at Syracuse in the wanton ridicule of the divine. It was not merely particular myths which Aristophanes used as materials for farcical representation, but it was the gods themselves who were degraded into men, were made their equals in all fooleries, and unsparingly lashed, mocked, and held up to the laughter of the populace, by the very same poet who assumed the airs of advocate of ancient customs and piety against Philosopher and Sophist. The covetousness of gods, quite as exigeant as men, and always extending open hands;[1] their lustfulness, which incited them to love-adventures with the daughters of men, and to sneak stealthily into their company,[2]—are among the subjects treated in the coarsest manner; allusions to Ganymede, the favourite of Zeus, are not wanting.[3] In the "Birds," a religious solemnity with prayers and sacrifices is represented, the satirical frivolity of which exceeds all bounds. Further on, the poet represents a famine breaking out among the gods, since men cannot sacrifice to them any more, and the smell of sacrifices can no longer reach them.[4] If in general the toleration of this license on the comic stage is a phenomenon not easy of explanation, the enigma is further enhanced by the last-mentioned play having been brought out immediately after the time of the mystery riot and the mutilation of the Hermæ, when people at Athens, once roused to suspicion and violence, thenceforward condemned almost every one against whom a charge of irreligion was brought.

What little sympathy the zeal for religion, which folk then made a show of at Athens, derived from any deeper conviction of the heart, is shown by the tolerance, nay the favourable reception, accorded to Euripides, "the philosopher of the stage" of that day. While the soothsayer Diopeithes carried his point, in obtaining a decree of the people to the effect that such as did not believe in the gods, and taught metaphysics, should be proceeded against in the courts of justice,[5] after which the people in blind passion pushed the investigation, and threw many families

[1] *Eccles.* 779–783. [2] *Aves*, 556. [3] *Pax*, 724.
[4] 848 sqq. 1515 sqq. [5] Plut. *Peric.* 32.

into misery on suspicion of profaning the mysteries,—the scholar of the condemned Anaxagoras had the daring to produce upon the boards physical doctrines, inimical to a belief in the gods, of the marriage of heaven and earth, of the generative powers of nature, and of the ethereal vortex. At a time when "meteorosophy" was already synonymous with atheism, he dared to praise the fortunate man who contemplated the everlasting order of the world, its plan, and its laws,—but, to say the truth, he at the same time pronounced warnings against "the crooked, sinuous paths of natural philosophers, who with befooled tongues, and guided by no true insight, misconstrued invisible things."[1] Once indeed, he raised the indignation of his spectators, when he made his Melanippe open with the words, "Zeus, whoever he be, for I only know about him by hearsay"; but he must have managed to give the verse a turn to make it tolerable, and yet so as that its irony should be felt by all. He gave no offence, however, when Hecuba in the *Troades* exclaimed,

> "Whoe'er thou be, Zeus, hard art thou to ken,
> Or nature's iron law, or mind of men:"[2]

that is, the father of gods and men could only be one or other; either the blind law of necessity at work in nature, or the intelligent principle in man. In the same drama there follow blow upon blow, the most audacious hits at Zeus and the gods in Troy for having abandoned their sanctuaries to destruction; and it was said plainly that all service of the gods was fruitless, and that sacrifice and offerings afforded no protection against ruin.

If Zeus suggested to Euripides the signification of a cosmogonic principle only, and was identified in his mind with the ether, the personality of the rest of the gods could have no other value in his eyes than their subservience to his dramatic machinery gave them. We here and there get a glimpse of his taking them to be, some mere powers of nature, others allegorical figures, as when he turns Selene into a daughter of Helios, when he makes the Muses to be born of Harmonia in Attica, and reduces Demeter and Dionysos to the elements over which they presided.[3] At

[1] *Fragm. inc.* 153, 158. [2] *Troad.* 886.
[3] *Phœn.* 175; *Med.* 831; *Bacch.* 274–285.

the same time he combats the myths which attributed to the gods vulgar lust, thirst of blood, and revenge, as the invention of miserable poets. "If the gods do evil," he curtly declares,[1] "then are they no gods"; and with the energy at once of a poet and a moralist he encountered popular errors—such as that one could commit evil daily, and yet hide it from the gods, or the perjurer and the murderer could escape scot-free with an easy repentance. He expresses himself sharply and boldly about the impostures of divination, including even that of Apollo; to particularise, in the *Electra*,[2] probably composed after the catastrophe in Sicily, when the remembrance of their having been made fools of by lying diviners remained still fresh and painful on the minds of people. He treats with almost undisguised contempt of the whole matter of soothsaying—"the best seer was the one who knew how to form a good judgment;"[3] and he put into the mouth of his Melanippe a formal disquisition upon and confutation of the entire doctrine of prodigies. As he did not believe in a Providence, or divine conduct of human destiny, he accordingly introduced these heresies upon the stage in a daring form, in part of axiomatic assertion, in part of scepticism. Man's destiny is not determined by piety, he said; he has only to use his hands boldly and violently, and he gets all by title of plunder.[4] Even the gods are greedy for gain, and the deity is now admired who has amassed the largest amount of gold in his temples.[5] The human soul was to him the real god, descended of the ethereal world-soul, and so far immortal as to return back, after death, into the ether, thus precluding all idea of personal existence.[6] On this point his expressions concerning the value of life and the other world are hesitating and contradictory. The comfortless sentiment of individual annihilation soon overpowered him; and when he is in this tone of mind, the life of earth is his only reality, death an empty shadow;[7] and then he turns again to think of the philosophical doctrine of procession from,

[1] *Belleroph. Fragm.* 23. [2] 399, 971 sqq. 1300. [3] *Fragm. inc.* 128.
[4] *Hippol. vel. fr.* 1, 2. [5] *Philoct. fr.* 5. [6] *Helen.* 1014–16.
[7] *Meleagr. fr.* 20, and the passages in Valcknaer, *Diatrib. in Eur. Fragm.* pp. 140, 141.

and continued existence in, the world-soul, and, after the fashion of Heraclitus, throws out the question, "Who knows, then, if life is not death, and to be dead here below should not be considered as life?"[1]

Thus, then, Aristophanes might assert, without any excess of malice or exaggeration, that Euripides had persuaded men there were no gods.[2] Whether it were that the poet himself, towards the close of his career, felt the necessity of return in the direction of the prevalent tone of thought at Athens, or that a change of mind had really taken place in him—so it was, his last drama, the *Bacchæ*, is a sort of recantation, in which the traditional positive religion is taken by the hand against all human repinings and subtleties. In truth, it is the veritable, passionate Dionysos worship, in all its wild extravagance, upon which the poet hangs his outpourings of religious conservatism; and the repulsive picture of old age, carried away by bacchanal frenzy, which is here produced as the pattern of genuine piety, hardly admits the entertainment of the thought that he was in earnest at heart with this glorification of the old traditional religion. Certain at least it is, that since Homer, no other poet had so lasting and powerful an influence upon views of life among the Greeks as Euripides.

The case was different with his contemporary and rival Sophocles, who proved himself throughout a true believer, and one who honoured and glorified the gods of his fatherland. Man always appeared in his dramas as a being free to choose, but, after all, an instrument to execute the will of the gods, either unconsciously or against his own wish. He did not attempt to clear up what was obscure in the paths of human destiny, or to exhibit an always just government in the deity. Feeling the impossibility of finding the solution of this enigma in the cycle of the religious ideas of his day, he recommended a quiet acquiescent submission to the inevitable. If the fragment is to be considered authentic, in which he says of Helios, "the wise called him the generator of the gods and father of the universe,"[3] we are driven to the conclusion that his treatment of the popular gods, in accordance with the

[1] *Polyid. fragm.* 7. [2] *Thesmoph.* 451. [3] *Fragm.* 772.

state worship, was grounded more upon the principle of accommodation than on his individual conviction. On the whole, his ideas about the gods move within a very contracted circle. The manifestations of these gods consisted principally in the punishments with which they visited the presumptuous, and the ruin they suspended over the heads of the thoughtless. And if, in his *Œdipus at Colonos*, in the last fortunes of the guiltless but unfortunate sufferer, a euthanasia was represented, which, as approximating to Christian ideas of death and hope, is otherwise foreign to paganism; in his *Ajax*, on the other hand, we have the ethical imperfections of the Greek god-system dinned into our ears. The part played by Athene in his *Ajax* and her invitation to Odysseus to feast his eyes, out of harm's way, on the misfortune and degradation of his adversary, whom she had smitten with madness, will be enough to convince us of this.

It is indispensable here, for a right understanding of the internal sense of the religious mind of the Greeks and the reciprocal action of philosophy and religion, to consider accurately terms and ideas which play into one another, such as those of destiny, of the jealousy of the gods, of the origin of evil, and the fall of man into sin. The notion of the gods being jealous of men, and that high distinction and personal superiority, as weakening a mortal's dependence on them, aroused their displeasure, and attracted their heaviest visitations, is to be found in existence as early as Homer,[1] but unassociated there with any such serious sentiment of guilt, as is the usual concomitant where man has fixed more precisely his relations to an unmerciful, repulsive, and angry deity. In Herodotus, as we have already mentioned, the view of the jealousy of the deity, as ordinarily following upon the heels of great good fortune, is put forward as an axiom drawn from the common experience of mankind. If Plato afterwards asserted that jealousy found no place amid the choir of the gods, yet there was a counter view, always widely disseminated, a view so natural to the obscured religious conscience of the Greeks, unacquainted with Oriental dualism, that it long survived amongst them, and was only gradually rejected

[1] *Odyss.* iv. 181, xxiii. 210, xiii. 125.

when belief in the existence and influence of evil demons had become more general, and events could now be put down to the score of these intermediate beings, the causes of which had been sought for in the jealousy of the gods at an earlier period.

All religions resting on the deification of nature must have a fatalist bias; for the invariable rule and the inflexible order, moving in strict conformity to law, which nature exhibits, is necessarily ascribed to natural deities. But the more these gods develop into complete anthropomorphic personality, the more decided the momentum of free action comes out in them, and overpowers the naturalistic fatality. Then, as these gods always were conceived as personalities, and could only, therefore, have been produced and have existed in time, and as the Greek theogonies are connected with wars of gods, and a succession of dynasties among them was taught, the Greek intellect accordingly saw itself forced back again to the acknowledgment of a dim power behind and above these gods, who once existed not, and therefore were finite. And even Zeus himself had his limits, like the other gods; he was always but one of many, a god who had his origin in time; the empires of evil and of death were hostile powers, uncontrolled even by him, though he and his gods on their part were subjected neither to the one nor the other. This destiny power (Ananke, Aisa, Moira), who, in the Greek conception, could never assume a proper perfect personality, is herself not free, she wills and executes the necessary, not from free choice, otherwise she would have become a deity amongst the rest of the free gods, with a complete personality, and so would have ended inevitably by being absorbed in Zeus. Had this process been worked out in the Greek conception, polytheism would have gradually passed into monotheism, and the other gods have fallen to the level of demons or angels.

Thus, then, we observe in the Greek religious conscience and in its poetry, which is partly source, partly mirror, of popular belief, a continual oscillation between an inanimate law of the universe, ruling all, the gods inclusive, and the personal power of the gods, acting either according to inclination and caprice, or to wisdom. Had the gods been

contemplated as absolutely and universally subjected to the power of destiny, certainly man would not have taken the useless trouble to have recourse to sacrifice and prayer for aid from such powerless hand-bound beings. These, then, had their limited spheres, within which they exercised a free power; Zeus, in Homer, sometimes steers destiny according to his will, at least so it seems, and at others he must bend his wishes to its decrees; when a man's fatal hour arrives, no god can help him, much as he may love him.[1] If Homer makes Zeus exclaim, "Man is the most deplorable of all that creeps or flies on the earth,"[2] still it is not he, the god, who has prepared this pitiful lot, the worst of all, for the race, to which besides many sons and descendants of Zeus belong, but it is "inexorable destiny." A story in Apollodorus shows how Zeus has to find a shift by which to reconcile the contradictory decrees of destiny.[3] One might say Zeus stands there in the relation of the animating element to the spiritless and unconscious matter of destiny, perfecting and giving form, in the individual case, to the biddings of an all-mighty Moira.

The idea of the inevitable power of destiny, "which to deprecate is an impossibility even to a god,"[4] seems to have received a further development about the time of the Persian war. Frequent consultation of the oracle must have contributed to this; besides, the answer of the oracle was itself a destiny which neither sacrifice nor prayer could bend, and from the fulfilment of which there was no escape. The disposition of men generally to shift moral responsibility for evil deeds from their own shoulders upon those of any other conceivable power external to themselves, was no less common among the Greeks than the rest of mankind. Instances accordingly are not wanting in which an evil and accursed deed is excused on the ground that its perpetration had been suggested to the soul under an impulse from destiny, or from the gods, that was irresistible. It is but the same attempt made in another form, when (as recorded, for example, in Herodotus[5]) his crimes serve as pretexts for the deity, the minister of destiny, to overwhelm a man in misfortune to which he was infallibly predestined without

[1] *Odyss.* iii. 236–238. [2] *Iliad*, xvii. 446. [3] Apoll. ii. 417.
[4] Herod. i. 91. [5] *Ibid.* i. 8, iv. 79.

them. Hence Ate, too, belonged to the powers of destiny, that blinding and delusion of the intellect, which brings destruction on man by betraying him into crime.

In the tragic poets, Æschylus and Sophocles, fate has assumed a more moral signification, in part that of a predetermined disposition of worldly economy, in which the individual, whose pride or short-sightedness rebels against it, is destroyed; in part, also, that of a guiltiness and a curse attached to it, which works on from generation to generation, and is ever begetting new transgressions, till at last the whole house is overwhelmed. Sometimes Zeus is represented as the supreme director and guide of destiny;[1] or the pair, fate and Zeus, seem identical. Fate is no other than the decree of Zeus himself;[2] while in the *Prometheus* even the supreme god is subordinated to the might of destiny above him, as all other beings are, dreads its decree, or the fulfilment of the curse denounced upon him by Cronos his father, and seeks to avert it from himself.

The best efforts, then, of the tragic poets to exalt generally the conceptions of destiny, and to set forth in glowing colours the unfettered lordship of Zeus over human affairs, would not have advanced the Greek conscience to grasp a Theodicæa; and though for a few instants, or with a few individuals, the ideas of an ethical economy of the world, lost in the legendary gloom of polytheism, might have been illuminated with a transitory gleam, they would soon have been clouded over again and blotted out. The seat of the difficulty lay in the failure of the Greek to catch a living hold of the nature of evil and of sin, and an insight into their origin. His language even afforded him no precise terminology for the morally bad, for sin; the expression for it was synonymous with physical evil; and it was equally impossible to distinguish in terms the positive bad from that which is wrong or mean. There are three leading features which serve to indicate what the heathen sentiment and doctrine was in regard to sin and to the bad. It was at one time represented as a something innocent, or the guilt was transferred from man to the deity, or, lastly, as irresistible.

[1] Æsch. *Agam.* 1485; *Suppl.* 822. [2] Æsch. *Suppl.* 1047; *Eumen. extr.*

Hence, if the Greek in humbling himself before the power of the gods once recognised that all good comes definitely from them, he would necessarily put to their account the evil he detected in himself, in the way Theognis, for example, expresses it: "Without the demon, man was neither bad nor good, and it was the deity itself who inflicted Hubris (arrogance) as the first wound to man's nature."[1] As for the doctrine of Æschylus,—"A god makes mortals guilty, when he is minded to overthrow a house from its foundations,"—Plato held it to be so hazardous, and was so keenly alive to the ruinous effect of this notion of a satanical element in the gods, that he forbade the youth of his republic listening to anything to that effect.[2] It has been already shown what a mechanical and external notion the Greeks had of defilement, as well as of its correlative, purification after sin committed.

No people had a more lively impression of the non-satisfying and comfortless nature of this earthly state and the general misery of man, or have given vent to it in stronger terms, than the Greek. How frequently do their poets, historians, and philosophers proclaim that man is, of all creatures, the most deplorable, that earth and sea are full of harm, and no asylum anywhere for the much-persecuted mortal. With the sombre thought, "it were best not to have been born at all, and next best, to die right early," the Greeks were in many ways familiar, in spite of their otherwise cheerful ideas of life; and one of their own gods, Silenus, had imparted it to Midas as the true view of existence.[3] It was that which, Aristotle says, was in every mouth, and had been for long known to all. In fact, nearly every one of their more famous poets introduced the sentiment into his works.[4] They either said, "He whom the gods love dies in early youth;"[5] or with another turn, as in Euripides, "Man has tears to shed over the babe newborn, but has to bear the dead to the grave with joy and good wishes."[6]

[1] Theogn. v. 165, 151, 540.
[2] *Rep.* p. 380.
[3] Plut. *Consol. ad Apoll.* c. 27.
[4] *Bacchyl. fr.* 2, *ap. Stob. Floril.* xcviii. 27; Eurip. *Belleroph. fr. ibid.* 39; Soph. *Œd. Col.* 1216; Alex. *ap. Athen.* iii. 97; Theogn. *Gnom.* 425.
[5] Menand. p. 48, Meinek; *Hypsæi fr. ap. Stob.* xcviii. 24.
[6] Eur. *Cresph. fr.* 13: cf. *Fr. inc.* 160.

It is the consciousness of the vanity and nothingness of human efforts, and the feeling of an inner void in existence, but unsupported by the high religious thought that can comprehend everything, and can only lend life a substance and a meaning, which was given utterance to in this sad and gloomy view. Has the sense of a universal guilt and of a sinfulness rooted in our nature co-operated in it? We are obliged to say, No, in answer. There are, it is true, two expressions which may be alleged as implying an acquaintance with original sin; one the saying of Democritus, that the whole of man from his birth onwards was but sickness;[1] which, however, it is certain the philosopher of Abdera meant chiefly in a physical sense, though perhaps he did not quite exclude the moral one; and then, a dictum of Euripides, that evil was implanted in all men.[2] But upon the whole the Greek estimated moral evil far too lightly, and found far too little of the law of sin in his members to have gained a clear insight into a truth against which human pride rebelled so stoutly; and there is no people in history that has come near the Greeks, first, in inclination to and talent for veiling evil under forms agreeable to the sense and æsthetically beautiful, and then in readiness to apologise for it.

Nevertheless, the legends of the Greeks preserve unmistakable remains and echoes of a tradition of original sin, and of the changes long ago wrought in man thereby, only that the old tradition is, as it were, in fragments, which must be pieced from the myths composed by different races. The legend of Epimetheus and Pandora is one of this *débris*. The woman sent by the deity, who was angry with man, to ensnare his mind, was the first of women, the parent mother of the race, who opened the lid of the box, and by that act brought all evil on man, who had previously lived unscathed by labour or disease. Here, in consonance with the numberless bitter complaints of, and imprecations upon, the whole female race that abound in the Greek poets, the existence of the sex is treated as the fountain-head of all woe. Now Pandora is Eve; only the fundamental notion —attached to her by the Hellenic race as the abstract of

[1] *Ap. Pseudo-Hippocr. ep. ad Demaget.* tom. iii. p. 10, Kühn.
[2] *Ap. Stob. Foril.* x. 17.

everything seductive and captivating, on whom all the Olympians heaped their gifts to the injury of man—is, that the creation of woman was a divine punishment or revenge, and the source of all man's misery,[1] as also, that it had been better for man if he had always remained alone.

The beginnings of the human race and of the Greek people are ever running into one another in the Greek traditions. If the later myths represent Deucalion and Phoroneus to have grown out of the slime of the earth, and the Arcadian Pelasgos out of a mountain of rock; on the other hand, the older tradition assigned to them a like original with the gods, and they are children of Oceanos and Tethys (water or moisture) according to Homer, or of the omniparent earth, as Hesiod and Pindar sing.

> "The family of gods and men is one;
> Twin breaths are we, of one same mother born,"

was said by the latter.[2] The all-ruling Zeus is remarkably exempted in the old myths from being described as the author of the human race; he is only represented as being the ancestor of particular families, and that by intercourse with a mortal woman. In Hesiod's poem on agriculture it is Zeus who created the human race, which, however, he destroyed again as a punishment. The new race, or humanity generally, did not owe their existence to him, the angry, ungracious god, but originated with the Titan, Iapetos (the fallen one, thrust down from the height of bliss). It is the Titan's son, Prometheus, who creates man out of the four elements, and particularly earth and water. According to one form of the saga, an event followed thereupon which in the Greek myth corresponds to the fall. Prometheus, who is spoken of as creator of man, the first man himself and representative of the whole species, cheated Zeus in the division of the victim, who, in turn, deprived men of fire for their punishment, and hid it. Prometheus, discovering this, restores it again to man; Zeus, in retaliation, sends all miseries upon them through Pandora, at the same time changing their hitherto peaceful and intact primal state into a destiny of gloom and suffering.[3]

[1] Hesiod, *Opp. et Dies*, 56–58; Theogn. 590–613.
[2] *Pyth.* iv. 291 (?).
[3] Hesiod, *Opp.* 42 sqq.

The revenge taken by Zeus himself on Prometheus forms the subject of that grand drama in which Æschylus represented the two gods involved in an unequal struggle, entered into on man's account. Zeus appears here as the all-powerful sovereign of the universe, but his power, for which in part he was entirely indebted to Prometheus, is not unassailably established. His fall, a subsequent change in the sovereignty of the world, is in perspective under certain conditions. But the Titan, who is in the same degree of divine descent with Zeus, hardly yields to him in penetration, and through his insight into futurity, an inheritance derived from his mother, is even his superior; he combines in himself the features of the fallen being, hardened in scorn against God and corrupter of man, with those of his saviour and friend. It is he who saves humanity when Zeus had already decreed its destruction; to him it owes its exaltation from its low, unintellectual, vegetating state. He has furnished man with all the fruits of the tree of knowledge; and, healing their ignorance, has introduced them to all the wisdom of this world, all its arts, and not only to everything capable of adorning life, but in short to all that he would have been deprived of, if the dynast in heaven had had his will, and that would have remained the particular property and distinction of the gods.[1] Thus is he the great benefactor and protector of man, and this love of his for the mortal is the cause of his unutterable and infinite torments:

> "I have ventured it—I still have saved man's race,
> Uncrushed—ungulfed in Hades' endless night.
> This why he bows me with such martyrdom;
> Abetting man, pain on myself I have called."

The vengeful arm of the enraged god now falls heavy on him; nailed upon his cross of rock, he takes on himself with unshrinking hardihood tortures which he had foreseen and might have averted. Strong in the consciousness of his immortality, he still raises himself above his destiny. In the far future he descries his liberator, Hercules. True, Hermes declares to him he can only be redeemed by procuring a god to die for him of his own free will. Yet this too is to be accomplished; the Chronid Chiron, the justest

[1] Æsch. *Prom.* vv. 119 sqq. 546, 109, 254, 506, 443–506.

and wisest of the Centaurs, wounded past healing, offers himself for Prometheus.[1]

How wonderfully the broken rays of higher knowledge and primitive tradition here appear, how strangely tinted, yet transparent enough to admit of their original form being recognised! Far indeed beyond the ordinary horizon of Hellenic genius do the ideas of this pregnant drama extend; so far, that possibly it was but little understood, and, for what we know, the succeeding Greek literature did not venture much upon the subject. In truth, the representation of God suffering stands out here in marked contrast with the notion of Hellenic paganism on the same subject. There the god, as for instance Dionysos, Attes, or Adonis, is but nature withering and dying off to find a fresh bloom in death. Here, however, the god suffers for man's sake as their benefactor, and thus there are in Prometheus three personalities and three functions or objects, mixed up throughout one with the other. In his enmity and defiance of the world's ruler, he resembles the fallen archangel converted into Satan; and as, at a later period, the Gnostic sects contemplated as man's benefactor the serpent spirit enticing our first parents to eat the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge, so here Prometheus, the imparter to them of forbidden science and art, is represented as the protecting and rescuing genius of man, and, again, as of his own free will suffering for them. At the same time, he is the primal man and representative of the whole species as rebelling against the deity and his law, and earning, in requital, a sad and painful existence, though he descry in the distance a redeemer and a divine deliverer, who will give himself up to death for him.

The Zeus elsewhere so highly extolled by Æschylus, and lauded as the most blessed of the blest, appears in this drama in the light of a tyrannical despot, ruling without law, ungracious to man, spiting their protector and threatened in the far future with dethronement by his own son, just as he himself had treated his father. This has afforded

[1] Apollodor. ii. 5. 4. Æschylus makes Mercury notify that condition; the fulfilment of which, through Chiron, he certainly must have represented in his concluding drama of *Prometheus delivered*, as in all other parts he agrees perfectly with Apollodorus. See Welcker's *Trilogy*, p. 48.

ground for the assertion that the poet must have reserved the redemption for his concluding drama of the series, the *Prometheus delivered*, but so delivered as fully to justify the obduracy of Zeus in refusing pardon to Prometheus till he made humble submission. But Æschylus is not representing the revolt of a created and finite being against his creator, but a struggle between two gods, neither of them self-existent, and one of whom, the persecutor, owes his victory and supremacy to the persecuted. In a poet like Æschylus, who, as Pythagorean,[1] could make the hylozoic-pantheistical declaration,

> "Zeus is the air, and earth, and heaven, and more;
> Zeus is the all of worlds, and all besides,"[2]

it can be no matter of astonishment that one who has brought upon the stage elsewhere the battle of the old gods with the new, and the injustice that the former met with, should for once throw Zeus into the shade when contrasted with the Titan friend of man, and, in accordance with the myth, should have glorified, not the power and stern hardiness of the one, but the unyielding constancy of the other. In his *Prometheus delivered*, he adopted the Orphic idea of a reconciliation having taken place between Zeus and the Titans whom he had overpowered, for he formed his chorus of these Titans, who had themselves been delivered from the prison of Tartarus. His general attachment to the Orphic teaching is shown by the special reverence with which he treats Dionysos and Demeter, claiming to have received his poetical laurels from the former,[3] and styling the latter "the foster-mother of his intellect."[4] Accordingly it is conceivable that when he proclaims the fate threatening Zeus, he had in his mind's eye the Orphic doctrine of the revolutions and successions in the world's sovereignty, through which Dionysos was at last to occupy the place of Zeus. Meanwhile it is certain that in the concluding play the liberation of the Titan was affected by means of

[1] Cic. *Tusc.* ii. 10.

[2] *Fragm.* 295. "The harmony of Zeus," on which so much stress has been laid (*Prom.* v. 551), may also be understood in a Pythagorean sense, and would hardly furnish an adequate proof of respect to popular religion on his part.

[3] Pausan. i. 21. 3.

[4] Aristoph. *Ranæ*, 886.

a treaty of peace concluded between himself and Zeus, implying probably that a relenting towards the human race had taken place in the heart of the supreme god.

The old and universal tradition admitted, in general, that man continued to exist after death; but the Greeks of the Homeric age did not dream of a retribution appointed to all after death, or of purifying and penitential punishments. It is only some conspicuous offenders against the gods, who, in Homer, are tormented in distant Erebus. In Hesiod, the earlier races of man continue to live on, sometimes as good demons, sometimes as souls of men in bliss, or as heroes; yet though inculcating moral obligations, he does not point to a reward to be looked for beyond the grave, but only to the justice that dominates in this economy.[1] Where they were not utterly material, the opinions of the Ionic philosophers must have been confused and vague. What Thales called the soul was nothing more than a moving power at work in the animal and inorganic substances as well as in men. Hence the expression, "the magnet must needs have a soul because it attracts iron." Generally speaking, the opposition between soul and body had not fallen into the range of cognisance which these thinkers had embraced; they merely added to their conception that the soul was a peculiarly subtle and pure element of their primal matter. To Anaximenes the soul is air, which keeps man together, as respiration and air do the world:[2] and Diogenes of Apollonia called the air outright soul and thinking power.[3] Heraclitus termed the soul the most incorporeal thing of all, and therefore it was not absolutely incorporeal to his mind, but rather an exhalation ascending from the universe, a secretion of its primal element of fire; on which account he declared the dry soul (approximating most to the state of fire) to be the wisest and best, and derived its power of acquiring knowledge from its capacity of rapid motion.[4] When he asserted our now life to be in truth death, and the so-called death an entrance into life, and clothed the same thought in the mythical

[1] *Opp. et. Dies*, v. 121–124, 140–142, 166–173, 213–380.

[2] Plut. *Plac. Phil.* i. 3.

[3] *Fragm.* 4, *ap.* Panzerbieter.

[4] Aristot. *de Anim.* i. 2; Plut. *Plac. Phil.* iv. 2; *Fragm.* 61, 62, in Schleiermacher's *Heraclitus*.

formula, "we live the death of the gods, and die their life," or, "men were mortal gods, and gods immortal men,"[1] his notion was not an individual continuance of existence—an impossibility in his system; but he considered the divided state of this life as a captivity and a severance from the main life of nature, and therefore deserving to be called death, in comparison with that higher life. The Ionic philosophers generally saw in the souls of individual men only a part of, or emanation from, the living power that is manifested in the universe. On the death of the body, this portion took its backward flight to the whole, to which it originally belonged.

In the face of notions such as these, the Orphico-Pythagorean doctrine must have had the more attraction to earnest souls of an ethical cast, as two important truths or observations, deeply grounded in the aspirations and perceptions of man, had taken form within it, namely, the remembrance of a primitive fall into sin, and the consciousness that the immortal, guilt-stained soul required a purification, and could only return again to the presence of the pure and holy deity, after the completion of its penance. Now Plato expressly ascribed to the Orphic writers the dogma of the soul's finding herself in the body as in a sepulchre or prison, on the score of previously contracted guilt: a dogma indubitably ascending to a very high antiquity on the testimony of Philolaus, who names "the old theologians" as its propounders.[2] It is from this source that Pindar drew, who, of the old Greeks, generally, has expressed notions, the most precise and minutely distinct, of trial and retribution after death, and the circuits and lustrations of the soul. He assigns the islands of the blest as for the everlasting enjoyment of those who, in a triple existence in the upper and lower world, have been able to keep their souls perfectly pure from all sin. On the other hand, the souls of sinners appear after death before the judgment-seat of a judge of the nether world, by whom they are sentenced to a heavy doom, and are ceaselessly dragged the earth over, suffering bloody torments. But as for those whom Persephone has released

[1] *Ap. Clem. Alex. Pæd.* iii. p. 215.

[2] Plat. *Cratyl.* i. p. 400; Philol. *ap. Clem. Strom.* p. 433.

from the old guilt of sin, their souls she sends in the ninth year back again to the upper sun; of them are born mighty kings, and men of power and wisdom, who come to be styled saintly heroes by their posterity.[1] This idea of the return of souls at appointed periods, till they become blessed heroes, approaches very near Empedocles.

This tissue of hopes and imaginings the Atomists rent away with a rude hand. The soul, said Leucippus and Democritus, consists of round fiery atoms, the connection of which is dissolved by death; and if those who are conscious of their evil deeds fear beforehand what is to follow after death, and spend their lives in anxiety and dread, that is but an invention and a lie.[2] The book of Democritus on Hades must undoubtedly have refuted the "superstitious" belief in the existence of souls in the nether world, and given an explanation from physical causes of all the cases of resuscitation on record. The Eleatics could no more have admitted a real immortality of the soul than the Atomists, for they recognised but one simple, immutable, primal unity, external to, and beside which, all individual existence could only be delusive appearance. Whether this simple primal being was conceived to be pure intellect or thinking matter, the system afforded no room for a personal duration of self-conscious spirits. At the first, Anaxagoras so clearly distinguished his intelligent being "Nous" from matter or ether, and placed the self-moving spirit victorious and dominant over it, as that he might have been able to develop a doctrine of immortality therefrom; he seems, however, to have merely taught a general and infinite intelligence, in which all single, intelligent beings partook in a higher or less degree, and in keeping with which he must have accepted a refusion by death of individual souls into the common world-spirit.[3]

It is particularly striking that Herodotus, whose cosmical speculations were thoroughly saturated with the religious opinions of heathenism, should have preserved such a silence on the subject of immortality as to make it at least strongly probable that he was a stranger to this

[1] *Olymp.* ii. 57 (105) sqq.; *Thren. Fragm.* 95–98, *ap.* Bergk.
[2] Stob. *Serm.* cxix. p. 603; Cic. *Tusc.* i. 11. 34; Lucian, *Philopseud.* 32.
[3] Simplic. *ad Arist. Phys.* pp. 33–35.

belief. According to him, they were Egyptians who first broached the idea of the soul being immortal: "some Hellenes" borrowed their doctrine of the migration of souls, and propounded it as their own. He also speaks as if it were something remarkable in the Getæ, that they should have believed in an immortality.[1] One is therefore driven to the conclusion that he considered this belief as by no means a common property of the Hellenic nation in general. But we hear again from Plato, that the Greeks of his time, as long as they remained in good health, ordinarily believed the sagas concerning Hades and the punishments there to be simply ridiculous; but when they saw they were nearing death, they could no longer subdue anxiety on their account.[2] The opinion that the soul flies away, at death, like air or smoke, or disappears into complete nothingness, was certainly common enough for the Theban Cebes to call it the people's opinion.[3] The astonishment with which Glauco received the declaration of Socrates (in Plato) of the soul's immortality, as something quite novel and unheard of before, shows how the case stood with the educated of those days;[4] while Plato's appeal to old tradition, to the sagas, poets, and lawgivers, makes it probable that the number of those with whom these authorities were of weight had always been considerable.[5]

Everything considered, the most probable conclusion is, that in regard to the duration of the soul's existence, Socrates had not got beyond a wish, a conjecture, a hope. Xenophon, who otherwise observes a complete silence on this question in all his writings, puts into the mouth of Cyrus, on his deathbed, reasons for the possibility of the continued existence of the soul, which were most likely borrowed from Socratic sources.[6] He makes the Persian king say to his children, they could not yet know for certain whether their father would absolutely cease to exist after his death or not; and then he appeals to the reverence which people show to the dead, the invisibility of the soul, the resemblance that death bears to sleep, and that possibly it could not arrest the activity of the soul; to the

[1] Herod. ii. 123, iv. 94.
[2] *Rep.* i. 330.
[3] *Phæd.* i. p. 77.
[4] *Rep.* x. p. 608.
[5] *Legg.* xii. 2. p. 959.
[6] *Cyrop.* viii. 7. 17.

terrors of conscience after the commission of a crime, to the observation that the soul was the living principle to the body, and to the probability that, when first freed from the bonds of the body, it would then develop a more independent energy. So far all is Socratic: Plato himself makes his master, in the *Meno*, assert the hope of living on, though not without a mixture of doubt; whilst the whole process of argumentation in the *Phædo*, as an unusual one with Socrates, must be attributed to Plato only, and his profound acquaintance with Pythagorean contemplations. Socrates, on his condemnation, pretended to explain the ground of his hope, expressing himself thus: "One knows not if death be not the greatest of all blessings for man"; but the conclusion of his speech left it uncertain whether he understood death to be an everlasting sleep, or a migration of the soul to some other sphere.[1] This was not mere irony in him, as Cicero thought,[2] but the expression of an hesitation in his own mind, that had not yet ripened into a decision. And so it is a certainty that his disciple Plato was the first of the Greeks to throw himself, in all sincerity, and with the whole depth of his intellect, upon the solution of the great question of the Immortality.

THE SOCRATICS—PLATO AND THE PLATONISTS

Three Socratic schools, distinct from the Platonic, were formed after the death of the master, but their founders either sought to blend with their own, doctrines of other schools to which they had partially belonged before coming in contact with Socrates, or they took a one-sided view of a single idea selected from the master's circle of thought, and thus spurious schools sprung up, in contrast with which Plato's genuine comprehension and grand development of the Socratic teaching shows the more brilliantly. Aristippus, the founder of the Cyrenaic school, and originator of Hedonism, started upon the Socratic view, that virtue lies entirely in knowledge, but that sensation is the criterion of truth; and probably also upon the acceptance of a flux of all things, so as to set a limit to the ethical knowledge

[1] Plat. *Apol. Socr.* 32, Bekker. [2] *Tusc.* i. 42.

of man, the object and determining principle of his actions, and therefore to the sensations of pleasure and pain. As all living creatures have pleasurable sensations in accordance with their natural instincts, man's highest good also consists in pleasure, enhanced by moderation and self-restraint in the enjoyment, while the bad and the naturally odious is pain and annoyance to him. The standard of the agreeable also decides the goodness or blameableness of an action. Prudence (phronesis), in which real virtue lies, consists in the clever calculation and just selection of that which is to be enjoyed, in the taking advantage of circumstances which may increase the agreeable, and in the art of giving every situation of life the most comfortable turn possible, and of only enduring so much of pain and fatigue as is unavoidable. To maintain freedom of intellect and thought, even in enjoyments, to be master of oneself and of pleasure, cheerfully to renounce what is unattainable, and not to long for the absent too passionately, to have no care for the future nor to lament over the past, to live only for the present, and in each moment of it to win the highest measure of enjoyment,—such is the sum of true wisdom and virtue. "Pleasure is a good," according to the assertion of the Cyrenian, "even when it has to be gained by means the most unseemly;" the distinction drawn between pleasures good and shameful rests only upon their being customary, not in their nature: Aristippus himself would give the preference to bodily pleasure over that of the soul, and yet at the same time would allow but one degree of distinction between the several pleasures; this, however, prevented the school from maintaining that the wise man must be free from passions, jealousy, superstition (meaning religion), covetousness, and, generally, everything that leads the intellect astray, or moves it too strongly.[1]

Theodore of Cyrene, a disciple of the younger Aristippus, was of ill fame as an atheist, and in fact a denier of all that was eternal and divine. On the one side, he remained firm in *the* principle of the Cyrenian school, *i.e.* a consummate egotism, and consequently rejected friendship and sacrifice for one's fatherland; the wise man, who is

[1] Diog. Laert. ii. 65, 79-93; Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* vii. 11. 191; Athen. xii. 63, p. 544; Ælian. *V. H.*

self-sufficient, having no need of friends, yet has the whole world for his fatherland. On the other, he attempted to push to an extremity the doctrine that placed the wise man's object and mission, not in the highest sum of distinct enjoyments, but in the abiding frame and tone of his mind, thus making him independent of externals; an effect produced by exclusion from the outer world, and the self-sufficiency of an egotism that calculates the most lasting enjoyments.[1] Hegesias, on the contrary, another professor of the Cyrenaic school, maintained that in life there is more evil than pleasure, and this latter is itself much more uncertain and illusive by reason of the dependence of the soul on the body, and the insecurity of our hopes and calculations, and therefore that wisdom consisted rather in the avoiding of evil than in the choice of the agreeable, and, above all, in that independence attainable by indifference towards all goods and their contraries, and even towards life itself. Thus a doctrine which held pleasure to be the highest good proceeded, by a natural course, to despair in the same: Hegesias became the advocate of suicide; and his doctrine was so frequently carried out into practice, that King Ptolemy forbade its being taught in the Alexandrine schools.[2]

The keenest opposition to Hedonism came from the contemporary Cynic school, and the development of its system of no wants and self-denial. Its founder, the needy and coarse Athenian, Antisthenes, copied the exterior of his master Socrates, and went far beyond him. He taught, how virtue consists above all things in labour and toil, in the banishment of sensual enjoyments, and the ascetic practice of a continual hardening of self: then, as it is peculiar to the deity to need nothing, he who carries out the principle furthest, to be in need of as little as possible, is labouring to advance himself in resemblance to God. Antisthenes despised science and art, as contributing nothing to the true end of life; and his disciples kept themselves still more aloof from all attempts at science or speculation. Philosophy was, for the Cynic school, only a mode of life. Its ideal was a wise man, who stood in no need of marriage, or children, or of a state, and carried out his principle of

[1] Diog. Laert. ii. 98. [2] *Ibid.* ii. 93–95; Cic. *Tusc.* i. 34.

independence of all external circumstances to the fullest. Diogenes of Sinope, the most celebrated of the Cynics, and whom Plato called a Socrates gone mad, despised all existing state laws and all human pride of birth, was first of the Greeks to style himself a citizen of the world, rejected marriage and the dominant religion, even in the form of mysteries, and had arranged for his private use a somewhat crude pantheism, as specimens of which his sayings, that all is full of God, and that all is in all through all, are noticeable. Meanwhile he did not affect to conceal that what indemnified him for self-imposed deprivations was in reality pride, the feeling, in fact, of being raised above the wants and passions of others.[1]

In the Megarian school of Euclides, the Eleatic character overpowered the Socratic element. The kernel of their speculative system was to be found in the doctrine of Parmenides, touching the eternal being, like unto itself alone, and alone existing, which, in Socratic fashion, it sometimes characterised as the good, sometimes as intellect and thought, and even as God. They also denied all multiplicity, all motion, all coming into being and ceasing to be, set down reality among the absolute nonentities, and explained evil, because contrary of the only existing good, as being the untrue.[2] In Stilpo of Megara, the last and most considerable member of this school, were united an Antisthenic and practical bias with that dialectically disputative one which, in the event, became the distinguishing feature of the Megarian school. Apathy of soul in perfection, pursued to the very ignoring of pain, was in his judgment the highest aim of wisdom.[3]

None of these schools could pass for the real intellectual successor of Socrates; it was only a genius as refined and exuberant as Plato's (429–348 B.C.) that was capable of such an inheritance. If he showed the most gratitude of all the pupils of Socrates, he also took upon himself to carry out the most important changes and results of the whole of antecedent philosophy: as Aristotle remarks, he attached himself even to Heraclitus, into whose system he had

[1] Diog. Laert. vi. 1 sqq. 103–105; Arrian, *Epict. Diss.* i. 17.
[2] Aristod. *ap. Eus. Præp. Evang.* xiv. 14. 2; Diog. Laert. ii. 106, 107.
[3] Plut. *de Anim. Trang.* c. 6; Seneca, *Ep.* ix.

already in early youth been initiated through Cratylus, and also to the Pythagoreans, finishing by making himself at home in the Eleatic doctrine by the aid of the dialectic of Socrates. He was acquainted with Egypt and Sicily from personal observation, and was by far the most universal intellect of the ancients up to his own time. And yet his philosophy was a genuine growth of the Greek intellect. The Socratic doctrine of the absolute good and beautiful, and of the Deity revealing himself to man as a kind providence, formed the basis on which he started. As channels for the Heraclitic doctrine of the perpetual coming into being and flux of all things, together with the Eleatic one of the eternal immutability of the one and only Being, the dogma of Anaxagoras of a world-ruling spirit was serviceable to him, and with it he had the skill to connect the Pythagorean view of the universe, as an animated intelligent whole, in a spiritualised form.

Though Plato never arrived at a finished system, rounded off and perfect in itself, nevertheless there is unmistakable evidence in his works of a continual progress, an effort after an increasing depth of foundation, and a stronger internal articulation, joined to a wonderful exuberance of ideas, often excessively bold. His teaching, however, does not merely issue from a scientific need of pure speculation, but concurrently from the conviction that it was the vocation of philosophy to accomplish for the Greeks what the state religion had not done and could not do,—the liberation of intellects from error and sin, and the supply of an economy of divine things, the world, and the destination of man, adequate to the requirements of his spirit. None of the old thinkers has set himself in a manner so comprehensive and profoundly calculated to the task of laying hold of the entire of man, of purifying human life, and filling up the void with a complement worthy of it, born of ideas, and directed towards eternity; of penetrating through and over and beyond the superficially "godlike" of older philosophers, even to the knowledge of the "kingly Spirit and living Creator of the world," and of inserting immortality and a future retribution as the innermost core of his teaching. Hence Plato's doctrine, more than any other system of antiquity, is at the same time religion, making its own

the endeavour to supplant the hereditary religion by itself, at least among the higher classes, and, had it but attained to the mastery, it must inevitably have converted the whole aspect of heathendom.

Plato held the supreme good, or God, to be unfathomable in his real nature. "It is hard," he said, "to investigate and find the Framer and Father of the universe; and if one did find him, it were impossible to express him in terms comprehensible by all."[1] For even though man is capable of a perfect comprehension of all other Ideas, still God remains above these, and higher yet above the world and all that is created. Hence there is nothing Plato more studiously avoids than declaring himself upon the subject of the divine nature: only in a few places in his works does he enter upon it, and then, like a determined monotheist, to distinguish by the designation of Demiurgus his one, really world-transcending, not merely thinking, but freely willing and good God, from the rest of the gods of the world system, whom he only calls by that name in a wider signification. Monotheism and polytheism are, in Plato's view, peculiarly connected.

Plato teaches, that for as many general signs of our conceptions as we have, there are so many really existing things, or Ideas, in the intelligible world corresponding: to man these are the only solid and worthy object of thought and knowledge; for they are eternal and immutable, existing only in themselves, but separate from all things and individual, while their manifold copies, the things perceptible by sense, are ever fluctuating and transitory. Independent of time and space, as well as of our intellect and its conceptions, Ideas belong to a world of their own, of another sphere, transcending sense. They are not the thoughts of God, but the objects of his thought; and, according to them, he created the world in matter. They only and God are really existing beings; and therefore earthly things have but the shadow of an existence, and that only derived from a certain participation in the Ideas, their types. Thus Plato blended the Heraclitic creed of a continual flux in all things subject to sense with the Eleatic one of an eternally reposing unity, whilst he metamorphosed,

[1] *Tim.* p. 28.

and, as it were, condensed into his Ideas the Pythagorean numbers, of which individual things are copies. In the *Timæus* he actually styles these Ideas thoroughly substantial in their conception, "eternal gods."

Notwithstanding this polytheistic mode of expression, these Ideas are not to be conceived as beside and external to God. They are founded in God, and God is the all-comprehensive Idea, embracing all partial archetypes in a unity; and therefore, too, the visible world, which is formed after this all-comprehensive Idea, and contains in itself in copy all single and partial Ideas, is one only.

Then Plato distinguishes the Idea of the good from the others. He places it above all the rest; it is the supreme one, hardly accessible to man's knowledge, and is never adequately known, though, without it, the knowledge of all else would probably not profit us at all. So little can it be placed on the level of any other essence or Idea whatsoever, that it is rather itself exalted above being—so far, that is, as it is in itself the cause of all true being, and the source of all that is beautiful, and of all derivative good; in the visible world it begets light and the sun, and in the spiritual it nurses truth and clearness of view.[1] Here, unmistakably, the Idea of the good is coincident in Plato's mind with that of God. Were God in his view really distinct from this Idea, then he could only be good from participation in the Idea of the good; and were this Idea really the higher and self-communicating, and God the lower and the recipient (for he also terms Ideas "invisible gods"), then the highest and most perfect Idea must necessarily be supreme God. Consequently there would be nowhere in the system fitting place to be found for a particular world-creating god, external to and beside this Idea.

Therefore, if God be considered to be Idea, that is to say, so far as he is the archetype followed by existing things, then is he the Idea of the good, and thus this Idea concludes within itself the aggregate of all Ideas, and is the definitive basis of the ideal world. Stepping out from his hidden existence, God manifests himself to the intelligible world of Ideas; he throws into prominence those aspects of his being which serve him as archetype in the creation of

[1] *Rep.* vi. 505, 509, vii. 517.

the world, and each of these aspects or Ideas presents the good in another form or relation.

The creation of the world came about thus: through God's active interposition, the Ideas, till then at rest in themselves, stamped their images on primal substance, on space, not void, but filled, on matter, formless, and without quality. This primal substance, this "mother of that which is to be," is eternal and imperceptible by the senses; it receives its determination, motion, and limits in space from the Ideas; it is the *hyle*, though Plato himself never uses the expression, which, without being itself corporeal, for that would be a quality, is the condition of the existence of bodily things, and is at the bottom of all as their substratum.[1]

This view of Plato concerning primal matter is one of the most disputed points of his doctrine. He accepts neither an emanation of matter from God, nor a pantheistic immanence of the same in God; and as the idea of a sheer creation was as little familiar to him as any of the old philosophers, there is accordingly nothing left but to avow a strong dualistic tendency in his system. His first principle, or no principle, of all being is certainly material; but it is not yet body, only a disposition thereto, still a material, not merely a possible one, and, so far, Plato styles this primitive matter something not yet entity. This first matter was then transferred into a condition of irregular motion, a chaotic state in which the four kinds of elemental bodies surged and swayed through one another without design. The principle of this motion was an intelligent soul, indwelling in chaos and ruled by the laws of a blind necessity;[2] and along with it the primitive matter already received certain forms before the dividing skill of the world's architect had acted on it, and so had passed into secondary matter, by this time visible and corporeal. It was this still chaotic state into which the divine intelligence first introduced order and form, while bringing the good down from the sphere of Ideas, and insinuating it into matter. Necessity was thus overpowered, the irregularly moved parts were separated and then connected in proportion, and matter generally was organised according to the primal type of eternal Ideas, the principles of form in things.

[1] *Tim.* pp. 27, 48, 51. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 52, 53.

Thus the world is as a child, whose father is God and whose mother is matter; but this latter was ever a barren principle without the fructifying action of God, for in every organised being the matter is first, and then the resemblance to an idea impressed on it by God; through this resemblance a creature has part in the plan and harmony of the world, whilst through its matter it partakes of the contingent, profitless, and evil.

The first of God's creations, then, was the world-soul; a factor which he employed in this creation was that eternal soul, moving chaos, sometimes designated by Plato the disorderly soul, or the concupiscence inherent in corporeal nature, sometimes as the variable entity apportioned to bodies, or the unintelligent power and necessity. This through the divine intelligence could be subjected to the yoke, tamed, but not, properly speaking, changed or destroyed; and it would be always rebelling again and bringing back the old predominance of indeterminate multiplicity, of disorder and of evil, were not God ever watching over the maintenance of the order once for all established by him.[1] But he has subdued it by binding it and blending it with the second factor, a divine ingredient, the *nous*, an emanation of his own essence.[2] To this end he first formed out of the two factors a mediate entity, so that in the world-soul, and in souls generally, we may distinguish three ingredients or entities, to which correspond the three intellectual capacities of the soul, opinion, knowledge, and contemplation.

The world-soul, then, is the first and most distinguished of created gods, having its seat in the middle of the world as extended in space, but being at the same time spread through its whole compass, which moreover it externally envelops, and the corporeal forms the carcass it animates and governs.[3] It is, in truth, but an individual being that has come into existence in time, though composed of eternal elements, and by no means does it contain ideas in itself; for these, on the contrary, are exempt from all limitation of space and time, and exist in independence of it as the eternal types of their copies in time. The world-soul too has no will, though it thinks as well as our souls

[1] *Tim.* p. 48; *Politic.* pp. 272, 273.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 369; *Tim.* pp. 44, 269.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 34–36.

do, and far better. It perceives all that takes place in itself and in its components, and is indestructible and immortal, and the motion dependent on it is no less imperishable than itself.

The accurate observer will accordingly find just three eternal principles, which Plato propounds to start with—God, or pure intelligence, the primal matter, and the soul. For already before the creation of the world there existed an intellectual partible, and yet incorporeal entity, which God threw in as a basis for the formation of separate souls, or employed as a principal ingredient. When God then divided matter and organised it into distinct bodies, he also divided this soul-like substance, and formed a number of souls, by infusing into them more or less of his own proper being, the divine intelligence.[1] Hence Plato calls the portion of the world-soul, and of the souls of stars and men, which perceive ideas, everlasting and divine.[2] Intelligence in its absolute fulness and highest perfection is found only in God, who is precisely intelligence itself. It is imparted to the world-soul and the souls of the stars in an eminent, yet still limited, degree. It is fuller in men's souls, though ever continuing to be a ray or spark of the divine essence dwelling in them, and stands in a somewhat similar relation to God that the ray does to the sun, from which it emanates. Hence the double nature of the human soul, in which, as Plato mythically expresses it, only one of the two steeds is noble and of good pedigree, while the other is of the baser descent and constitution.[3]

Plato, therefore, is no pantheist; matter is, with him, entirely distinct from God: still he has a pantheistical bias in his system; for all that there is of intelligence in the world, down even to man, belongs, in his view, to the divine substance. God himself it is who is present in all souls, through the intellectual power emanating from him, and reveals himself in them, but in degrees of extremest difference.

God, as a benevolent being and without jealousy, has so tempered the world's body out of the four elements, as to have given order to the previously chaotic motion of

[1] Plut. *Quæst. Plat.* ii. 2; *De Sera Num. Vind.* c. 5.
[2] *Politic.* ii. p. 309; *Tim.* iii. p. 44 c. [3] *Phædr.* iii. 246.

matter, and made the whole bear the greatest possible resemblance to his own nature, and therefore he fashioned it into a perfect unity, sound and never varying. He gave the world the most perfect figure, the spheric, and a circular motion: then, as being a body, it cannot exist in an invariable repose like the deity, and therefore must be in motion; still its motion, as an image of the divine nature, must be the one of closest resemblance to spirit, a reflex one on itself. Now within the womb of the world there exist, arise, and are changed, a multitude of individual bodies, and this world that embraces all, being in truth an intelligent animal, compounded of body and soul, styled by Plato a self-sufficient god,[1] a god perceptible, as type of the intelligible, the most perfect of all the gods who have come into existence, and blest, as having been made partaker of the good and beautiful.[2]

The world's creator went on to engender an entire family of gods in heaven, that of the stars, who move round there in their appointed course, as measurers of time. Plato at one time means by "Uranus" the universe generally, inclusive of the beings therein contained; elsewhere, the heavens proper, as the region of stars, in opposition to the earth. He divided the province of the world into three parts or diacosms: first and uppermost, the region of the heaven of fixed stars; below that, the middle space, in which the five planets with sun and moon revolve; and lastly, the region of earth, which he conceives to be resting in the centre of the world, and which he styles the oldest of the intramundane gods.[3] These world-bodies then are gods visible, and children engendered of an eternal father, and here Plato found room for the gods of the popular religions, who originally must have been but star-gods, as still was the case with many barbarians;[4] while Zeus (sometimes) passes with him for the supreme God, the creator of the world. These gods, whose bodies are for the most part composed of fire, are not indeed immortal, nor absolutely indissoluble, but the creator's almighty will maintains them and prevents their dissolution, and each

[1] *Tim.* pp. 34 B, 68 E. [2] *Sympos.* 202 C.
[3] *Rep.* x. 2, pp. 616 sqq.; *Tim.* pp. 38 C sqq.
[4] *Cratyl.* p. 397 C; *Legg.* x. 2, p. 886.

has his own intelligent soul as principle of his sidereal motion.[1]

Plato, however, was well aware that the Greeks did not regard his Olympic gods as astral deities, and that, generally, the greater number of the Hellenic deities could only be deduced from star worship by a very forced interpretation, though he continued of opinion that the oldest Hellenes were mere star worshippers. In the *Timæus* he expresses himself with unmistakable irony: "To speak of their establishment exceeds our powers; but, in obedience to the law, we are obliged to lend our belief to those who have spoken on the subject in earlier times, even though they could only do so without grounds of probability; for they pretended to be descendants of the gods, and, as such, claimed to know more about their own ancestors than any one else."[2] Nevertheless room is still found for these gods in his system of the world; but only, in fact, as beings of a very inferior caste—demons or genii. The world consists, he said, of twelve regions or celestial spheres, eight of which are occupied by igneous bodies. The three spheres below this astral province, and between them and the twelfth (or sphere of the earth), the regions of ether (as the subtlest species of air), of air and of water, are peopled by demons or genii, having bodies formed of the element predominating in their respective spheres, and therefore of ether, air, or water; and in some measure they follow the regular course of the stars.[3]

The supreme God could not, and would not, create the lower order of mortal beings himself, else they would have been equal even to the gods. Yet as the mortal also was to come into existence and the world to be a veritable universe, the highest God intrusted the sidereal gods with the immortal ingredients, the intelligent embryos of souls, to which they were to add the corruptible, and so, in

[1] *Tim.* pp. 40, 41; *Legg.* x. 2, p. 904 A.

[2] *Tim.* iii. pp. 40, 41.

[3] *Epinom.* ii. p. 981. It is true this is not one of Plato's works, but its contents are a faithful representation of the views of the old Academy. Xenocrates represents Plato's doctrine in the same way (*ap. Simplic. in Phys.* p. 265), as do also Plutarch (*Is. et Osir.* c. xxvi.; *de Sil. Orac.* c. x. and xiii.), Maximus of Tyre (*Diss.* xiv. p. 161, ed. Markland), Proclus (in *Tim.* p. 259), and Chalcidius (in *Tim.* pp. 222, 269, Meurs.).

imitation of the creative power of God, to form living beings. Hence man arose, the most God-fearing of creatures, with a soul fashioned of the same substance as the world-soul;[1] and the care and guardianship of the whole race was intrusted to the same gods who had created it.

The human soul, in its parts and motions, represents the world-soul in little. The one is formed like the other, after the idea of the good; and hence it is man's task to conform himself in his life, as well, to the resemblance of God. The essence of the soul, however, is not a simple one; but there are three elements, or essences, to distinguish in it. For, in the first place, man has an immortal soul element, the intelligence, the divine *nous*; and then, there also belong to the soul mortal portions: the one—the courageous, passionate, or angerful—Plato designates as the better and manlike part; the other, the inferior,—sensual concupiscence,—as the worse and womanlike. It is, first, in the connection which the spirit, the divine soul essence, forms with the body, that the two latter portions are added, as the vital energy of the body.[2] These three souls are physically separate, one from the other, in the body. The divine has its seat in the head: of the other two, the one, comprising the manly, generous passions, resides in the heart; the other, the womanly and sensual-appetitive, in the liver.[3] The divine soul should rule in man, but the mortal serve and obey it, not disturbing or hampering it in its higher functions. One sees there is no proper place to be found for the will in such a doctrine of the soul as this, and Plato has not accurately defined it; it is hidden in the passions of the lower, or manly and womanly soul.

Plato, like all philosophers of antiquity, stuck to the notion that like could only be known by like.[4] The spirit, the divine in man, is essentially the faculty of cognition; whence he is capable of knowing that which is of kin to him, or ideas including even the highest of them, God himself, an emanation and purest image of whom he is;

[1] *Tim.* iii. 69.
[2] *Rep.* iv. 439; *Tim.* 69, 72; *Politic.* 309; *Phædr.* 246, 253.
[3] *Tim.* 70, 72.
[4] Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* vii. 116: cf. Jambl. in Villoison, *Anecd.* p. 193.

but as this, the perceiving faculty in him, is but a spark which he has from the womb of the divine essence, the strength of which is in many ways impeded by its connection with inferior matter, and its brilliancy obscured, it is not possible for him adequately to perceive and conceive of God in the entire fulness of his being. The case is the same as with our eyes, which would be unable to take in anything of light if not themselves related to the sun, and did they not derive their seeing powers therefrom; and yet, on the other hand, are not in a condition to bear even to gaze on that luminary, or look into it in its brightness, while they remain in some degree capable of contemplating the nature of the sun in its effect, that is, in the light that radiates from it.[1]

Thus it is that the nature and descent of the soul declare that to perceive and know are its truer and higher vocations, from the perfect exercise of which its bliss or misery, virtue or vice, necessarily depend; for the soul has capacity of being happy through the pleasure arising from its knowledge, or of becoming unhappy from the pain associated with ignorance and error; and as the soul of necessity wills that which appears to it to be the better, so all its virtue consists in the knowledge it has, and all vices are reducible to error and ignorance.

It is here especially Plato shows himself a disciple of Socrates, and in like manner in his theory of beauty and the love of it, he followed the footsteps of him who used to say of himself that he understood and practised no other art than the erotic. That brightness of the supreme good and of the ideal world,[2] whose reflex man observes in its copies by means of his sight, is Plato's beauty; it first awakens in the soul the affection of love, composed of desire and the sentiment of pleasure; for, through the contemplation of a beautiful object, the spirit is reminded of that archetype of all beauty which it was granted him to gaze upon in an earlier state, God and the ideal world. The existence of the good, in fact, escapes us, as Plato says once,[3] in the nature of the beautiful, and yet, while man is loving the beautiful he is really in love with the good.[4]

[1] *Rep.* vii. 515 sqq.
[2] *Phædr.* 250.
[3] *Phileb.* 64.
[4] *Conviv.* 205.

Plato was just as much convinced of the life of the soul anterior to man's birth as of its immortality. He said, "The soul, the mistress, is earlier than the body; we are no creature of earth, but of heaven."[1] The number of souls was always a fixed and equal one; as many of them as are now in union with their body were also in existence in a previous corporeal state.[2] Then, like all followers of the creed of pre-existence, he adopts the notion that, by a previous act in the earlier life, every one's character in this earthly life was determined, meaning to indicate thereby the internal dependence, the abiding and permanence introduced into the otherwise systemless course of earthly existence, delivered up as it is to change and accident, and also to expose the common error that would throw off guiltiness from itself, either upon the gods or on blind fate. He has represented that decisive act of the still free and incorporeal soul differently in the *Phædrus* and in the *Republic*.[3] In the former, all depends on the strength with which the soul pursues the contemplation of that which truly is, God and ideas, and how it demeans itself therein; it may never attain to such contemplation, or may be overpowered by indolence and forgetfulness and not persevere, and so sink down to earth, and pass into a nobler or more worthless germ of a human body, according to the measure of its contemplative powers. In the *Republic*, on the contrary, Plato clothes that determining act in the myth of a choice which souls make of the chequered destinies of life, each in proportion to its penetration, whereupon every soul has its destiny established in accordance with its choice. Agreeably to this view, he has said in his last work, "Souls possess in themselves the principle of change, but, having changed, they go on their way as the order and law of destiny determine."[4]

Thus Plato taught an antecedent fall of the soul, consisting either in a defect in strength, an incapacity for the perception of the divine, or in a perverted choice. According to the first representation, all embodied souls are to be regarded as degraded; according to the second, the guilt strikes only the majority; for he says, individuals

[1] *Tim.* 90.
[2] *Rep.* x. 2. 611; *Tim.* 41.
[3] *Phædr.* 246; *Rep.* x. 2. 614 sqq.
[4] *Legg.* 904.

have made their choice, some in folly, some influenced by passion, dating from earlier life, rarely with the requisite prudence; but the blame, he adds, rests on the choosers; God is guiltless. The possibility of such a condition, precedent to all existence on earth, in immortal souls, meets with its explanation in the fact that Plato did not conceive the soul in this state as a pure and simple emanation of the divine *nous*, but as an already mixed and compounded being. God has taken the souls of men from the same cup or receptacle as that in which he formed the world-soul out of heterogeneous ingredients.[1] Accordingly there are also in the immortal soul of man certain parts deficient in knowledge and power, the better portion of which frequently gets overpowered and expelled. Therefore our philosopher has to do precisely that wherein the man of this life is powerless, and which otherwise passes for a dispensation of destiny, or an appointment of the deity, namely, to refer to the free decision of the individual the post and vocation to which he feels himself transferred, and the moral and intellectual talents and dispositions which develop themselves in him from his birth onwards. Again, in his last work he says, God has so directed the whole, that all that is born falls into the very position and place for its habitation which was absolutely necessary to its individuality, leaving, however, to the free will of each one in what way, and in what condition of soul, that should be carried into effect.[2]

As to what concerns moral conduct in this life, it is an assertion often repeated by Plato, that no one is wicked of his own free will. Injustice he deems a kind of sickness of the soul, which is quite as involuntary as the sickness of the body. The only defect in the bad man is in the knowledge and capacity to discern the good; he never really wills the evil, his error is only in judgment, and that he errs is an illness of the soul, a disease, but no act of free will. Whilst he deceives himself, his reason contracts an irresistible power, either from the influence of external objects, or from the defects of his nature, his physical and moral temperament: and even that decisive act of the still unembodied soul which determines its earthly career is, at bottom, no free spontaneous act, but the necessary result of

[1] *Tim.* 35 sqq. [2] *Legg.* 904.

the degree of penetration with which individual souls are endowed, and this degree depends upon the internal relations of the soul elements one with the other. Each soul, says Plato, necessarily chooses the lot which looks to it the best in its own way of thinking.[1] The soul is necessarily virtuous, on the strength of its divine principle, if sensual instincts, the passions of the two mortal souls, and the influences of the body, did not trouble and subjugate the divine part. So high does Plato estimate the influence of bodily condition, education, and external circumstances on the intelligence of the soul, joined with the character accompanying it from its earlier existence, that, with him, even on this side, necessity took the place of freedom, and man is either spiritually healthy, and therefore infallibly virtuous, or sick, and therewith unalterably bad and vicious.

Plato was in truth the prophet of the doctrine of immortality for his time and for the Greek nation. No one before him had undertaken in good earnest to prove the eternal existence of the soul from its nature, and, setting aside a little knot of Pythagoreans, he stood really alone in his confidence amongst his contemporaries. Even the other Socratic schools, the Cynics and the Megarians, seem to have left it no place in their systems; this is to be understood as true of the Cyrenaics as a matter of course. But to Plato this was a centre of thought, a foundation and corner-stone of his system, and specifically an essential condition of his doctrine of knowledge, as well as of the acceptance of a moral order of the world. Hence three of his finest dialogues are devoted to throwing light on immortality,—the *Phædrus*, representing the pre-existence of the soul; the *Symposium*, the bearings of immortality upon the relations of the present life; and the *Phædo*, death as the medium of a blissful future. According to Plato, the present life is at the same time not only the fruit of an earlier, but also the germ of a later life; and as the present fate of man is decided by his foregone life, so also is his future lot cast by his conduct now.

Plato begins the series of his proofs of the immortality by appealing to the eternal cycle of being and the interchange of opposite states in accordance with the theory of

[1] *Rep.* x. 2. 618, 619: cf. 413. 8; ii. 589.

Heraclitus. If all living things were to revert to death, as into a state of absolute nonentity, all nature must at last come to a standstill: thus, there is an eternal fluctuation of the soul between two opposite conditions, of the bodily and the bodiless, a cycle of transition from life to death and from death to life. A second proof is drawn from the pre-existence of the soul, accepted as a certain fact; and here Plato lays stress upon his oft-repeated saying, that all learning is a remembering of antecedent perceptions. A knowledge is implanted in the soul from the time of its incorporeal being, which lies long in it unconsciously, and is only reawakened by the perception of the senses; and while now embracing the truth in its grasp, it summons back to its recollection the really existing, the ideas which, during a foregone life, it has contemplated in the company of its God,[1] and longs for that blessed state again. To these are to be added the principles resulting from the consideration of the nature of the soul itself. The soul is the absolute principle of life to the body, and therefore the realisation of the idea of life; nay, the very ideas of soul and of life are identical;[2] and accordingly it would be a contradiction of that idea to conceive of the soul as subject to death.[3] Should it be destroyed, that must be the consequence of its peculiar disease—evil; but experience proves that evil does not produce that effect.[4] Further, in accordance with the axiom that like can only be known of like, the soul is of kin to the ideas, which it is capable of perceiving; and must also have in common with them the leading properties of ideas, simplicity, and consequently indestructibility and eternal duration. To say the truth, it is hard to reconcile the simplicity of the soul, here taken for granted, with the assertion in the *Phædrus*, repeated in the *Republic*, of a manifold nature of the soul, and one divided in itself.

The metempsychosis which Plato taught under Orphic and Pythagorean inspiration is an essential ingredient of his theory of the world, and is therefore perpetually recurring in his more important works. He connects it

[1] *Meno*, p. 81; *Phæd.* 72 sqq.
[2] *Phæd.* 105 sqq.; cf. *Rep.* i. 353; *Legg.* x. 895.
[3] *Phæd.* 102–107. [4] *Rep.* x. 609.

with an idea, sifted and taken from popular belief, of a state of penance in Hades, though it can hardly be ascertained how large a proportion of mythical ornament or poetical conjecture he throws into the particular delineation of "the last things," and of transmigrations. He adopts ten grades of migration, each of a thousand years, so that the soul in each migration makes a new selection of its life-destiny and renews its penance ten times, until it is enabled to return to an incorporeal existence with God, and to the pure contemplation of him and the ideal world.[1] Philosophic souls only escape after a threefold migration, in each of which they choose again their first mode of life. All other souls are judged in the nether world after their first life, and there do penance for their guilt in different quarters; the incurables only are thrust down for ever into Tartarus[2]—he attaches eternal punishments to certain particularly abominable sins—while such as have lived justly blissfully repose in the dwelling of a kindred star until their entrance into a second life. Plato was clearly acquainted with the fact of the necessity of an intermediate state between eternal happiness and misery, a state of penance and purification after death. In transmigration, men who have led an impure life must change their sex; and if they go on repeating a bad life so, they must degrade to the bodies of beasts, as their habits correspond.[3] Plato did not admit a migration into plants, like Empedocles. We must not forget to remark a trait here thrown in by him, that sinners punished in Tartarus are obliged to appeal imploringly for pardon and remission of their tortures to those against whom they have transgressed; and it is only on the prayer being really listened to, that they can be released from suffering.[4]

With all this, there was still the unsolved question of the origin and seat of evil, and the bad in the world; a question which, indeed, Plato does not enter into, nor does he seem to have been ever clear about. In his last work only he acknowledges himself driven to a dualism, when maintaining that the soul is the cause of good and evil, of

[1] *Rep.* x. 615.
[2] *Phædr.* 249; *Phæd.* 107, 113; *Rep.* x. 614; *Gorg.* 526.
[3] *Tim.* 42. [4] *Phæd.* 114.

the beautiful and ugly, of the just and unjust; and that, therefore, one must necessarily adopt two (world)-souls, one beneficent, and another to produce the contrary effect.[1] Plutarch has rightly enough asserted that he meant by this bad soul that "Ananke," or dark principle of nature, that irregular and unintelligent motive-power of matter, which, as the absolute non-divine, and therefore the opposite to the good, is never entirely overpowered and brought to terms by the divine creative power; for, as Plato says in his *Statesman*, the world receives all that is beautiful at the hands of its author, but whatever there is under heaven of evil and unrighteous, that it derives from its earlier state, and shares with living creatures.[2] Hence, according to Plato's view, a perpetuity of the evil in the world must be granted; for there is no escaping from the position of a something ever opposed to the good; which, he says, however, has not its seat among the gods, but attaches to mortal nature and this earth.[3]

Matter, then, is the seat of evil, and the source of all sin lies in the connection of the soul with the substance of the body. In its present state, the spirit is girt with an earthy mass, as with dross, pressing it down to earth, filling it with lust and concupiscence, and infusing an overpowering poison, against which knowledge or science serves as a remedy indeed, but from which it will never be completely free, except on the dissolution of the body by death. Plato imagined evil, in all its forms, as a disordering power penetrating into the composition of the soul. Unrighteousness is to him a discord of the three elemental ingredients of the soul, an uncalled-for interference of one in the other's business, and an insurrection of the inferior part of the soul against the superior, while that element, to which it naturally belongs to submit itself to the one appointed to dominate, will seldom exercise an undue supremacy. But that he also adopted a co-operation of sins, committed in the earlier existence, with those of the present, is shown by the way he addresses himself to a sacrilegious robber: "The evil which seduced thee to commit sacrilege comes neither from human nor divine impulse; but an impious concupiscence, deeply

[1] *Legg.* x. p. 896. [2] *Polit.* 273. [3] *Theætet.* i. 176.

rooted in the old and unrepented crimes of man, has seized thee, which thou must combat and destroy with all thy might."

Plato's doctrine of ideas obliged him to make his ethics harmonise with his physics. All that is good in the world is so only by virtue of the participation of sensual things in ideas; all knowledge of the true (of the idea) is at the same time knowledge of the good; as therefore ideas are the first principles of our knowledge, so also are they, or ought to be, those of our conduct. Plato was as little able as Socrates to accommodate knowledge with the will and the conduct, or to indicate the transition from one to the other. With him the active intelligence, while it forms itself to wisdom, is at the same time forming itself to virtue; or the true philosopher is also eminently the virtuous, and the principal stress is always thrown upon the higher knowledge. Wisdom, unclouded knowledge, is the one and universal virtue. Plato certainly recognises virtues to the number of four, so as that the three powers of the soul, the thinking, courageous, and concupiscible, correspond with the virtues of wisdom, courage, and prudence or temperance. The general representative of the law of proportion and self-restraint, or justice, rendering to all that which is befitting, is the fourth virtue, and is not distinct in essentials from the rest, but rather comprehends them in itself, being in reality only wisdom in its practical side energising in life. Realisation of the idea of the good, or the becoming like unto God, should be the supreme object of all human endeavour. But it is ever the dominion of the reason over the sensual and concupiscible, its victory in the struggle with these lower powers, the subordination of the instincts of ambition and gain to the nobler ones of knowledge, wherein virtue receives her consummation; and this victory, this dominion, rests upon the scientific development of the knowledge or knowing power. Plato, as a Socratician, has no answer to the leading question, "How, then, comes man to be fitted and determined always to act in accordance with his knowledge?" It is always taken for granted, that he who only knows the good, also does it, and that the guilt of not doing it lies

not in the will, but invariably in the perceptive faculty; a knowledge which, nevertheless, is only granted to the small proportion of mankind who are qualified for philosophy. It is easy to distinguish here the influx of that main doctrine of Platonism, that the intelligent soul in man is of a divine essence, by which the ideas of liberty and sin, of grace and love, are necessarily obscured, altered, or obliterated.

True to the notion he met with in the Orphic and Pythagorean school, that the body is the prison or tomb of the soul, Plato also hallowed the view of death, as the act that unbinds and liberates the imprisoned soul, being the most desirable thing that can befall a wise man.[1] Death should, therefore, be only the conclusion of a release, already begun and in progress, during this life—a release of the soul from the body that is a burden and vexation to it; as a means to which he points to the resistance of sensual pleasure, and the contemplation of ideas, or the pursuit of true philosophy. The thought of death in the midst of life, or of a real death consisting in the mastery of the sensual faculties through the dominion of the intellect, is one of those by which Plato is raised highest above his time and nation, and has become the precursor of another doctrine. At the same time he has recognised the damnable nature of the practice of suicide, regarded by the Greeks of his day as a duty and a virtue. Still, even here, it is but to the theoretical knowledge of ideas that the solution of this question is to be attributed, and that even when he declares, as in the *Theætetus*, "as evil cannot die, we must take our flight as quick as possible from hence to the gods; but this detachment results from the utmost possible approximation to God, that is, the well-considered practice of the good."[2]

In the *Republic*, his greatest work, and the richest in ideas of all, Plato introduces the idea of the highest good as the fundamental principle; and this, he says, as it has created the state in little, *i.e.* in individual men, should also form man in great, *i.e.* human society or the state. And while, on one hand, he quite takes the ground of the Greek popular character and Greek views, and attempts to carry

[1] *Phæd.* 62; *Gorg.* 492; *Cratyl.* 400; *Phædr.* 250. [2] *Theætet.* 176.

out the state principle of Lycurgus with a philosophical consequence most irrespective, and would even combine it with an Oriental system of castes; on the other, he soars high above the ethico-political views and forms of antiquity. For the idea of a moral and religious community which flits before him is no other than that which was to be realised, later on, in the Church of Christ, though certainly in a way which Plato did not forecast. To him the state is pre-eminently the great institute for instruction and education, which provides its members as well with the means of fulfilling their destination as of attaining to their happiness; for the bias received previously to the present life always requires a further quickening and guidance of the memory by instruction; and only in a well-ordered state is it possible for the individual to get the proper intellectual nourishment. Thus, with his eye resting at the same time upon the moral ordering of the world and the life of individual men, Plato built up his Republic as a copy and counterpart of both, never losing sight of this earthly life as the short span which a higher has preceded and a higher must follow; and for this very reason his state, furnished with absolute despotical power, suppressed and absorbed all personal rights and objects in its citizens. Dominion entails an aristocracy of the instructed; and these are in the state what the intelligence is in the soul, the triplicity of class in the one corresponding with the triple powers of the other.

It can cause no astonishment that Plato should have considered the Greek people as alone calculated for freedom (taking the word in its ancient sense of national independence), and all the other barbarous nations as without rights from nature, and born to slavery. Now his republic was to exercise an absolute dominion over all the relations of life in which his citizens shared; the individual life apart was to be merged entirely in the public life of the state; selfishness was to be exterminated, and a perfect community of interests and purposes to be carried out. The means of attaining this end betray a mistaken view and disregard of man's duties as an individual, a delusion about the moral relations of the sexes, which could not but have appeared incomprehensible in a man like Plato to after-times. Not

only does he condemn the great mass of the inhabitants of his state, the third caste, to unconditional service, but he will have also abolition of property for the two ruling classes; and as this can only be attained by the dissolution of families and of marriage, he consequently demands that women be put on an equality with men in education and civil employments, and burdened with all the labours peculiar to the male sex. The state was to take under its charge and direction the procreation of children; and the ruling classes, accordingly, were to be divided into a number of family groups, having wives and children amongst them in common. Every year the pairing of the sexes, required for propagation, was to be conducted with religious solemnities, the supervisors being allowed to practise deception in the casting of the lots. The children born were to be committed to wet-nurses appointed by the state; and to guard against over-population, or the growth of children deformed intellectually or bodily, prevention of conception or abortion, and the exposing or putting to death of such children, was to be encouraged. In fine, to complete the mass of absurdities, paiderastia was to be established; a vice he himself designates, in his treatise on *Laws*, as the ruin of entire states. It is only necessary here to mention, that all this is not a mere play of imagination, but downright earnest in the philosopher; and that even the apologies and extenuations, already attempted in antiquity by Epictetus, Plutarch, Lucian, and Clemens, are utterly inadequate.

Turning now to consider the position which Plato occupied in regard to the prevailing religion, it may be said, in general, that he essentially differs on this head from his own philosophical contemporaries and predecessors; that he has entered into it with greater care, accorded it a recognition, and allowed it a value, in no way to be set down to an interested accommodation. In his ideal republic no other religion than the received Hellenic one was to be admitted, nothing to be altered in the forms of divine worship; on the contrary, many points were to be left for the decision of the Delphic Apollo.[1] In his last work, *The Laws*, taking reality more into account than in the

[1] *Rep.* iv. 427, v. 461, vii. 540.

Republic, he enters into a number of special details as to the conduct of life, and is not, as there, only projecting the rough draft of a model state to be ruled by philosophers. In this thoroughly practical work, written with a decided reference to the wants of the lower classes, religion, in its pure polytheistic form, is the fundamental principle and life of the whole. He here marks out for worship the ordinary gradations of beings to be honoured: first the Olympic gods and the patron god of the city, then the gods of the lower world, and then demons and heroes.[1] To worship in the customary manner by sacrifice, prayer, vows, and other rites, is declared to be of all employments the most honourable and the best. All the blessings of public life are the gift of the gods, to whom everything in the state is to be consecrated; to violate their sanctuaries is the greatest of crimes. Festivals were appointed by the gods out of compassion for men, to restore good and to amend corrupt practice;[2] and the Dionysia even were expressly intended to be included in the category.

Plato distinctly maintained that no god ever came into contact with man, but that all intercourse between them took place through demons, and that sacrifice, consecrations, oracles, and, indeed, the whole mystery of soothsaying, depended on them.[3] It is accordingly undeniable that to him the service of demons constituted the greater part of the worship of the gods, which nevertheless did not detract from its value in his eyes, or make it less indispensable for the people generally. Even for the wise man, revelling in the perception of divine ideas, it might be advisable not wholly to forsake the worship of these intermediate beings; for, though he had the prospect of occupying a higher rank than they in the celestial economy, still he was for the present somewhat dependent on them in this sphere of existence. Yet Plato was of opinion, where the demons were already in occupation of a locality, a great deal turned upon the inhabitants treating them graciously or not.[4] And yet further, he seems to have considered it desirable that people should be led to honour by preference a higher class of divine beings, the star-gods: a knowledge of the supreme Deity is required only from the governing body.

[1] *Legg.* 717. [2] *Ibid.* 653. [3] *Conviv.* 202, 3. [4] *Legg.* 747.

A double consideration leads, he says,[1] to belief in the gods: first, the knowledge that the soul is older and more divine than all created things; and then the observation that the motion of the stars originates in an intelligent soul inhabiting them, which he elsewhere designates as a discovery newly made, and unknown to earlier times. Therefore also the study of astronomy is indispensable for religion; we should but blaspheme the great deities Helios, Selene, and the stars, if we advanced what was false of their revolutions.[2] In accordance with this view, that astronomy is the most excellent mode of attaining knowledge of God, the *Epinomis* distinguishes it as the highest degree of human wisdom.

Plato, then, allowed a wide space for popular belief in his system; but did not, for that, express himself less sharply or forcibly, from the moral point of view, against the mythical stories of the gods, and against the prevalent view of the relation of men to them. He stoutly combated three fundamental errors of Hellenic paganism: first, the notion of a quarrel and division of the gods among themselves; next, the delusion that the gods were stirred by the dark human passions of envy, hatred, and anger, and therefore allowed and ordained evil; thirdly, he denounced the universal opinion, that one would get off easy with the gods for one's misdeeds by recourse to sacrifice, forms of prayer, and ceremonies,—an error, on the disastrous influence of which he throws a clear light by the observation that people fancied they could wipe away the guilt of unrighteous deeds by feasting and merry-making. Here, then, he had an opportunity of putting the Greek legends of the gods in their proper position. On the one side, indeed, he felt, if the people were to honour the gods at all, they were not to be mere phantoms and abstractions, but should have a history; and that education was not to be without these divine legends, which formed the most suitable intellectual food for the young; and future citizens should be acquainted with the popular belief. But, on the other side, he found that myths generally proceeded on false and unworthy conceptions of gods and heroes; and such ideas necessarily stir in, and dwell upon, the minds

[1] *Legg.* 967. [2] *Ibid.* 821.

of youth. Hence, he looked upon the high authority of the Homeric poem, from which the Greeks drew their first intellectual aliment, and formed their religious ideas, as a misfortune, and would have had this poetry excluded from the education of youth. He considered as objectionable the allegorico-symbolic, or physical, interpretation of myths, already at that time in vogue among the Sophists. On the other hand, he thought, with a good object in view, it was generally allowable to deceive, and therefore fables and sagas were not to be omitted as vehicles of instruction to youth. Accordingly the composition of divine and heroic legends was to be proceeded with; but their composers were to be watched, for reasons of policy, their fictions put to the proof, and mothers and governesses admonished to tell children only the fables and myths approved by authority.[1]

In Plato's doctrine the philosophical spirit of the Greeks received incontestably its highest impulse. For seven hundred years it enthralled and swayed intellects more profoundly and powerfully than any one other philosophical system, and this was owing principally to its being directed to the religious requirements and instincts of man, and to its efforts both to assimilate such of the purer conceptions of popular belief as admitted of spiritualisation, and to fill the voids made by heathen worship. Platonism, then, is calculated to be, essentially, a doctrine of moral power answering and offering happiness. Plato defines the task of his philosophy as a loosening, freeing, and severance of soul from body, as a dying and a meditation upon death, as a cleansing of the soul from all pleasure and pain, which nail, as it were, soul to body, and render it corporeal.[2] He had confidence in the regenerative vigour of his dogmas, and thought that, once people had learnt through them to attribute the guilt of their errors and ignorance to themselves, they would fly in their discontent to philosophy, with a view to become other men than before they had been.[3] It is a glance into the future, full of prescience, that he casts when drawing the picture of supreme justice, or perfect virtue, as tried and enlightened by suffering, and when sketching a just man, whose constancy is never

[1] *Rep.* ii. 377, 382. [2] *Phæd.* 64–67. [3] *Theætet.* 168.

shaken under the strongest suspicions of injustice, and though prisoned, scourged, racked, blinded, and at last degraded to the death of the cross.[1] In this certainly Plato is a prophet and precursor of Christianity, though he is so, on the whole, more in a negative sense. His teaching stimulated wants and brought men to a clearer consciousness, which it was incapable of seriously and permanently satisfying by itself; and while its expositions and reformatory efforts first showed up clearly the interior weakness of the Hellenic religious system, it also attempted to infuse into the rotten vessel contents that would have inevitably burst it in the fulness of time.

A short retrospect to some of the principal points of Platonic speculation will be enough to answer questions lately so much agitated afresh; how far this doctrine was really akin to the Christian, and whether beneath the veil of expressions identical or similar in sound, there be also the germ of the same ideas latent. Plato's monotheistic conception of God is one of the most refined to which ante-christian speculation attained; yet he contributed nothing whatever to the knowledge of the perfect, living personality of God, and its absolute and unconditional liberty. Men of old, and in the earlier Christian period, fancied that frequent traces of a divine Trinity were discoverable in him. Alcinous, by an arbitrary distortion of Platonic doctrine and a combination of it with the Aristotelian, deduced a complete divine Triad therefrom; and the new Platonists converted the predicates of God, between which Plato had merely known a metaphysical distinction, into self-subsisting hypostases. And by this Christian theologians then allowed themselves to be deceived into evolving out of isolated expressions a doctrine, or at least the forecast of a doctrine, to which he was in truth an entire stranger.[2] Plato himself, in fact,

[1] *Rep.* ii. 361, 362.

[2] The places in which a Trinity was believed to be hinted at are particularly *Tim.* 37 C, where God is styled the Father, who has begotten the world like a son, as an image of the eternal gods, *i.e.* ideas. Had Plato really intended here to explain the idea of procreation as a communication of essence, he would have been a pure pantheist. Next, *Rep.* vii. p. 517, a passage where God is spoken of as the idea of the good, the intelligence emanating from him and his work, the sun. If there is an allusion to a Trinity here, then the sun is the third

distinguishes between the archetypal world of ideas and the world, which he also calls good, or the world-soul; though the latter, with him, is a particular created god, not eternal, and there is a wide distinction between the collective sum of ideas, never represented by Plato as a really personal unity, and the Christian Logos.

Further, Plato's god is not creator, but only maker, of the world. There is a dualism of a Demiurgus and a pre-existent matter, which, though the philosopher insists on its being conceived as much as possible without qualities, even denying it being, is still a something, a Hyle. This dualism is connected in him with a pantheistic tendency, so far as he admits a divine element in all souls. The human race is, on one side, allied in essence to the supreme God, but, on the other, separated from him by an insurmountable chasm; for man, on the whole, is a work not worthy of God, that could only have been performed by inferior and created gods. Heathen destiny, as "Ananke," or necessity of nature, is with Plato also a bourn and a fence, which neither God himself, nor the good generally, can step over. The soul can never partake of absolute freedom from evil, or of impeccability, though sin be but a disease of the intelligence, ignorance, dulness of conscience, non-intelligence. The guilt which causes souls to fall from the transcendental world down to this earth is no sin strictly speaking, but rather something accidental, a defect of intellectual power; and accordingly the remedy or the redemption is but a coming to oneself, or a rehabilitation or recollection of the intellect, mounting on the ladder of heavenly ideas, a higher self-love; and this redemption is only conceded to a small proportion of distinguished philosophical spirits. Plato's great world-system at bottom has no conclusion, and revolves in an everlasting circle.

hypostasis. Lastly, the obscure and intentionally mysterious passage in the second Platonic letter (p. 312 E), on which Plotinus has already exercised his keen genius (*ap. Euseb. Præp. Ev.* 17, p. 536), and which the author himself declares intelligible to such only as have been initiated into all the mysteries of his doctrine. Putting out of sight the probable spuriousness of the letter, there appears in the words, *ἐκεῖνο αἴτιον ἁπάντων τῶν καλῶν, δεύτερον δὲ περὶ τὰ δεύτερα, καὶ τρίτον περὶ τὰ τρίτα,* to be a latent allusion to the three spheres, adopted by Plato, of ideas, star-gods, and men, the good in which is all referred to divine causality.

Even purified souls, reconducted to the contemplation of the ideal world, can always degrade into the world of sense through negligence or guilt contracted in those ethereal spaces, and must then enter into body, repeat again the process of sin and cleansing from sin. Thus, therefore, no soul in reality can ever attain to a fulness of bliss that is quite imperishable.

The general character of the Platonic philosophy led to this result, that Plato's disciples and successors, the teachers of the Academy, renouncing on one side the Socratic doubt and indecision, actually enunciated the hypotheses and conjectures of their master in the stiff scholastic shape of dogmatical propositions; yet that, on the other, they departed from their adopted creed in some of its important definitions, much as they laboured to preserve its spirit. Plato's nephew, Speusippus, attached himself again to the Pythagorean doctrine of numbers, but distinguished deity or *nous* as well from the Pythagorean one, as (against Plato) from the good;[1] and this he did not contemplate as an original thing, but as one that develops itself in things and out of them; for the good and perfect being first proceeded from the imperfect. But at the same time he styled the deity "the all-governing animal power,"[2] which (as world-soul) penetrates the world in its extent from the centre outwards, and also encompasses it from without.[3] He appears, then, to have considered the Platonic conception of the deity as primal good to be a mere abstraction; and, in the place of it, attempted to substitute the concrete and material, but at the same time intelligent, world-soul of the Pythagoreans. By so doing (and here also he was in opposition to Plato) he extended the immortality of souls to their unintelligent element,[4] and this was so far consistent in him, as he considered the human soul to be only an emanation from that of the world, and at once and indivisibly intelligent and unintelligent.

For the space of twenty-five years after Speusippus, the

[1] Stob. *Ecl.* i. 58.

[2] *Vis animalis*, Cic. *N. D.* i. 13.

[3] Theophr. *Metaph.* ix. 322.

[4] *Olympiod. Comm. in Phæd.*, in a fragment communicated by Cousin (*Journ. des Savans*, 1835, mars, p. 145).

Academy at Athens was directed by Xenocrates (339–314), Plato's faithful associate, a man universally held in high esteem for the ascetic severity and blamelessness of his life. His teaching, too, departed from the Platonic formally and materially so widely, that later authors like Numenius asserted that he, as well as Speusippus and Polemo, had swamped Plato's system by the introduction of strange doctrines.[1] Xenocrates also brought about this reformation in Platonism by the infusion of Pythagorean elements, and by a closer blending of philosophy with the polytheistic religion, a double bias common in fact to the whole of the post-Platonic Academy. In the first place, then, we must have Plato's doctrine of ideas screwed on again, so to say, to the Pythagorean system of numbers. The mathematical number (no longer the ideal) must be the adequate expression of ideas themselves, and so, in consequence, the notions god, world, and soul, be again thrown into arithmetical form. His supreme god, or Zeus, is the monad, as the summary of immutable being. Next to him, the male, or Nous, stands a Dyad, a female conception, the mother of the gods, or world-soul; whilst the former, Zeus, rules in the heaven of fixed stars, the region of the unchangeable, she is the mistress of the changeable world, in which the sun and moon and five planets revolve; she furnishes these stars with souls, and at the same time inhabits the elements in the form of sublunar demons (Heré, Poseidon, Demeter). These heavenly bodies with souls make eight Olympic gods together with Zeus, and to them the three elemental gods mentioned are to be joined.[2]

Xenocrates carried out his doctrine of demons in a very peculiar way, and it was by this part of his doctrine he afterwards exercised the most extended influence. These intermediate beings between (Olympic) gods and men, produced by intercourse of the two, contain the divine, not pure and unmixed, but rather subject to suffering states of soul, capable of joy and sorrow, with gradations of moral character, whilst the good spirits are authors of

[1] *Ap. Euseb. Præp. Evang.* xiv. 5.

[2] Stob. i. 63; Aristot. *de Cœlo*, i. 10; Theodoret. *Gr. Aff. Cur.* p. 495; Plut. *de fac. in Lunâ*, c. 29.

all that is good and useful; there is also a class of noxious and dark demons, from whom harm and misfortune proceed, and who rejoice in those parts of religion which do but displease gods and good spirits—for instance, unlucky days, and feasts that produce blows, scourgings, fasts, and obscene talking.[1]

In combination with Empedocles and with Plato, who, in his *Cratylus* and *Phædo*, had already designated the souls of men as demons, Xenocrates also includes them in the demon world. "Eudaimonia," he said, "belongs to one who has a good soul; the Cacodemon is he in whom an evil soul dwells as its demon."[2] But in general he defined the soul in the Pythagorean manner as a self-moving number, which enters from without into man; and he said of it, in allusion to the Orphic myth of Zagreus, that it was held by the body "in Titanic gripe."[3] Possibly, too, he considered it as an "apospasma," a part or fragment of the world-soul, which, on the dissolution of the body, returns from division into the unity of the whole. A confirmation of this appears in his assertion, that even unintelligent animals have an immortal soul, that is, a soul not passing away with death, but only flying back again into the great fountain of life.

ARISTOTLE

Plato's most illustrious disciple, and at the same time his greatest opponent, and one in many ways unjust to his master, was Aristotle, the philosopher of Stagira (384–322 B.C.). This universal doctor of antiquity, whose powerful spirit embraced and worked out the whole circle of human science of the day, who educated the great conqueror of the world, stood on the boundary-line of two periods, like an intellectual Janus, and terminated and centralised in himself the intellectual acquirements of the Hellenes. Honoured at once as a teacher of philosophy and as its lawgiver, he exercised a vast influence on all subsequent

[1] Plut. *Isid.* c. 26.
[2] Aristot. *Pop.* ii. 6; Stob. *Serm.* civ. 24; Clem. *Strom.* ii. p. 417
[3] *Olympiod. in Phæd. l.c.*

centuries. He was first creator of the sciences of logic, ethics, and psychology, and from the fulness of his empiric knowledge built natural history and politics into shape. True, the Platonic doctrine constituted the basis from which he moved; but the great versatility of his genius, and the unmistakable contradictions and gaps in the core of that doctrine, admitted of his striking into new paths. The two great thinkers of antiquity form, in fact, an almost complete contrast. If Plato is eminently the philosopher of intellect, Aristotle is transcendently philosopher of nature. If the one was ever striving to soar above nature into the regions of the ideal world, the other would depart as little as ever he could from the solid ground of nature and experience. If Plato, little troubled about a strongly articulated and conclusive system, was only occupied in the continual fashioning of his ideal kingdom and the dialogistic representation of its development, Aristotle, on the contrary, the dogmatic systematiser, to a style devoid of ornament, compact, and reducing everything to the shortest possible expression, united an accurate knowledge of all accomplishments of the day, maintained a perfect mastery over his matter, and sometimes exhausted in a few lines subjects which Plato had spun out into several dialogues. Where the one entered with zest into figures and mythical representations, and clothed objects with a poetical brilliancy, there the other confined himself, with an almost mathematical rigour and dryness, to the naked sober reality. Profound where he appropriates his master's ideas, modifies, or alters them, Aristotle appears no less acute in refutation, particularly where he has to deal with the Pythagorean aspect of Platonic philosophy, with the confusion of the systems of numbers and ideas, and where combating Plato's views of matter and the formation of the world. Still, on the whole, Aristotle was not so powerful nor so speculative and creative an intellect as a critical one, assuming a polemic attitude to the teaching of others.

Aristotle conceives the relation of God to the world differently from Plato, not as that of an artist or master-builder, but as that of a last end and final cause. The world is from eternity; as the whole cosmos is without a

beginning, it is therefore also indestructible; external to it is neither space, nor void, nor time, nor what depends from them; Plato's dualism, "god and hyle," assumes in Aristotle another shape, "god and the world"; matter never existed out of which the world came to be framed. The primitive matter with him is only an abstract, a bare conception of the intellect, nothing in reality, but only the possibility or disposition to become the logical condition of existence. Only individual beings really exist; a matter pre-existent to them is to him inconceivable.

As Aristotle rejected and combated the Platonic doctrine of ideas and its consequences to the uttermost, so he placed in nature herself the forms that appeared to be embodied in her. They are not planted by God in nature; they rather constitute her real essence, and she in truth required the intervention of a summons or solicitation from another being in order to bring to light the numberless germs of form lying in her potentially. For the world is imperfect and defective in itself—it is in need: in sooth, it is the everlasting birthplace, the teeming mother and receptacle, of all material forms; but these must have first been elicited out of it by a being superior to itself.

This being, this supreme cause, by all dreamt of, but by no one hitherto rightly known,[1] is God. He is the highest good, who, by his mere being, solicits nature, that is, as the universal object of desire and love, fascinates every creature in which excitability resides, and thereby throws it into the motion and development suitable for outwardly shaping its real nature. He has not, it is true, either made or formed the world, which is from eternity; nor had he any need of it; but he is nevertheless the terminus, the crowning τέλος of the world, the object of its efforts and aspirations, and in so far too appertains to it.[2]

Accordingly there is an essential distinction between Plato's god and the god of the Stagirite. Plato's god is an intelligent power, who knows the world, and is at work in it, forming, ordering, and sustaining it; but the first cause of Aristotle is pure intelligence, without power,—an eternal, ever-energising, simple, infinite, and incorporeal substance, which corresponds rather to the world-soul of Plato than

[1] *De Gen. et Corr.* ii. 9. [2] *De Cæl.* ii. 10–12; *Phys. Ausc.* viii. 6–10.

his Demiurgus.[1] As the divine nature is immaterial, so a plurality of gods cannot be granted. God is therefore one only God, without parts and indivisible;[2] if the world were not, he would still have been ever what he is, and just as he is it. His action begins and ends with himself; but he conceives only the absolutely perfect, good, and beautiful, and so himself alone; and in this self-contemplation he is blest.[3] God is thus not an inactive idea, a being lost in repose, but ever active; this activity consisting only in the thought of self. As the animal life is that of sensation, and the human life is the practical and social, so the divine life, that of intelligence, consists in the invariably even energy of its solitary self-contemplation, from which pleasure and delight are inseparable, just because it is activity.[4]

Hence there is nothing in God other than the action of thought incessantly occupied with self. He is himself his own object, and can have no other. From the height of this pure activity the divine intellect cannot descend to particular beings, is unable to change the object of his conceptions, or think anything discursively, without falling into the hands of change, and without changing from better to worse.[5] He also really influences the world unconsciously, as the magnet does the iron; and his action on it is no voluntary action. If God were to know the world, he would also know the evil in it, and therewith contract a contaminating knowledge that would debase the knower. Thus, then, the conception of divine providence, which Plato had set up, was again abandoned. God is, indeed, the cause of all harmony in the world, but does not even know of the existence of this world and its harmony. Aristotle compares the action of God upon the world to the influence which the beloved object produces in the lover. It is not by a mechanical impulse that God, who is himself absolutely immovable, is able to move the world, but only as the beautiful or good moves the soul, and as the object of desire the desirer.[6]

Aristotle has not troubled himself with questions on God's goodness, justice, freedom, and relation to good and evil in

[1] *Phys.* viii. 10; *Met.* xii. 7.
[2] *Ibid.* xii. 8.
[3] *Ibid.* xii. 7.
[4] *Eth. Nic.* x. 8, vii. 14; *Met.* xii. 8.
[5] *Ibid.* xii. 11.
[6] *De Gen. et Corr.* i. 6; *Met.* xii. 7.

the world; for the most part they have no significance for him. His God is not a really personal one, or is only an imperfect personality. He never comes out of himself, out of his eternal repose, to energise. He is but the term and end of the world's aspiration, not the active cause of the world: on the contrary, complete repose is necessary for God, as well for his dignity's sake as for his blissfulness; for every action upon the world would be a toil to him, even though he held it in his hand.[1]

Only the first or uppermost heaven, the sphere of fixed stars, is directly moved by God. This celestial world, embracing all that is in space and time, forms therefore the extremest bounds of the universe externally, and is the place of perfect being. It is composed of ether, an indestructible heavenly substance quite distinct from the four elements, and hence divine as they, and having the circular motion, as being the perfectest. The middle region, in which are the five planets, with sea and moon, Aristotle calls heaven in like manner. It consists of a number of spheres, lying over one another and containing stars, which, on the one side, are dependent on the circular revolution of the upper heaven, and at the same time describe courses of their own. In fact, even to the Stagirite the stars, or rather the moving powers or souls of the heavenly bodies and their spheres, are divine beings, high raised above men, which, eternal and unmoved in and for themselves, allure these bodies and spheres into motion.[2] Lastly, the sublunar region, with its earth in the middle of the world structure, remains under the influence of the constellations, and the sun in particular. It is exposed to the vicissitudes of coming into being and passing away from it, and hence is

[1] The older commentators have attempted to discover a divine providence and government of the world in many passages of the Stagirite. Founding themselves on some accidental expressions, not part of the strict system, but squaring with popular notions, in which Aristotle is speaking of an act or arrangement of God extending into the world, in spite of his repeatedly limiting the knowledge of God so precisely to his own essence, they have fathered on him the doctrine that God produces the world through the realisation of his own ideas, *i.e.* the ideas pertaining to his own essence; and thus that, while he contemplates himself, he also knows the world. Now Aristotle never mentions the doctrine of ideas but to combat it. His twelfth book of *Metaphysics* and eighth of *Physics* leave no doubt on the point that his god is not a motive power, and that he knows nothing but himself.

[2] *Met.* xii. 8; *De Cœlo*, ii. 12.

the arena of change; and God is only mediately and indirectly the cause of movement to sensible and transient creatures. As to the elements, Aristotle does not derive their proper motion from the first perpetual motion of the uppermost heaven.

Aristotle's view of the stars was a connecting link which enabled him to hold on to the popular religion. The astral spirits, or sphere-gods, were the beings originally worshipped by man. This is the primitive tradition, which received its mythical dress when man assigned those gods a human figure, or that of a beast with a human face, in order to persuade the multitude, and for the sake of the law and general interests.[1] He distinguishes, accordingly, several degrees of development in the religious system, and, of these, he considered the oldest to be the purest. In them was contained the original and genuine germ of belief in the divinity of the stars, *i.e.* those moving principles, or celestial potentates, from which the motions of the several spheres proceeded. That germ by degrees became enveloped and veiled from sight in the cloud of mythical elements, local and genealogical sagas, and the whole apparatus of conceptions and fictions, intentionally or unintentionally, humanised. Hence he also remarks, "Those who attributed a human shape to the gods merely converted them into eternal men and invented them a human existence, dissembling the truth that the stars are much more divine than man."[2] But Aristotle did not at all deduce the fact of man's having derived the conception of the divinity of these astral beings, in the oldest time, from any kind of higher revelation, but from the reflex notions of men about their physical state in sleep and the approach of death, as also about certain meteoric phenomena. For instance, if man, from the observation of a prophetic power manifesting itself at times in the soul, had grasped the idea generally of a divine one, the contemplation of heaven and meteoric phenomena next taught him that these stars were visible bearers of this divine power.[3] One sees that Aristotle could not for long

[1] *Met.* xi. 8: cf. *De Cœlo*, ii. 1.

[2] *Met.* iii. 2; *Polit.* i. 2, p. 1252; *Eth. Nic.* vi. 7.

[3] Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* ix. 20–23: cf. Cic. *N. D.* ii. 37. The fragments there cited are probably from the *Eudemus*, a lost dialogue of Aristotle's.

go so far as Plato in the acknowledgment of the popular religion, and on good terms with it. Neither the supreme god nor the astral gods could, according to his system, interfere in any way in earthly and human matters. In the sagas of the gods, a great deal, to his judgment, passed for calculated fiction, the offspring of political objects and interests, though he also conceded a physical or ethical germ in many myths.

Aristotle was at just as great a distance from Plato in his doctrine of the soul, and his position upon the question of immortality corresponding to that doctrine. He quarrelled with pre-existence and metempsychosis, as maintained by the latter. The belief that any soul could enter into any body it liked was as absurd as that architectural science could lodge in a flute. Plato's theory of reminiscence was equally frivolous; that we should have ideas without being conscious of them, was a contradiction.[1] In his view, the soul existed only as quickening the body, without which it was impossible to recognise it. It is the principle that gives form, motion, and development to the body, the entelecheia of it, *i.e.* that substance, which only manifests itself in the body which is formed and penetrated by it, and continues energising in it as the principle of life, determining and mastering matter. Thus the body is nothing of itself; it is what it is only through the soul, the nature and being of which it expresses, to which it stands in the relation of a medium in which the object, the soul, is realised; and so it cannot be imagined without the body, nor the body without it; one must be produced contemporaneously with the other.

Aristotle distinguishes three component parts in the human soul; the nutritive power, the sensitive (the faculty of imagination and capacity of desire), and the nous or thinking power. This last is the differentia of man, and he makes it divisible again into two parts, the passive and the active, understanding and reason; the first, bound up with the soul as the soul with the body, and as form in matter, is manifold and diversified in individuals, and is extinguished with them. The reason, however, or intelligence pure, has nothing in common with matter, comes from without to the

[1] *De An.* i. 3; *Met.* i. 9; *Anal. post.* ii. 19.

man, and exists in him as a self-sufficient indestructible being, neither diversified nor divided. The nous, or reason, accordingly, allows souls, with their bodies, to sink back into nothingness from which they severally issued. It alone exists on, ever the same and unalterable; for it is no other than the divine nous in individual existence, the divine intelligence enlightening the night of human understanding, and must be conceived just as much the prime mover of human, discursive thought and knowledge, as of his will.[1] What God is to the universe, the highest principle of motion, the same is the nous also for the human soul. But by this doctrine the unity of the soul and of its activity, elsewhere so distinctly asserted by the Stagirite, is in fact again demolished.

And by it also a question is decided, which was often debated in antiquity, how far the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was admitted by the philosopher. The really human in the soul, that which has come into being, must also pass away,[2] the understanding even; only the divine reason is immortal; but, as the memory belongs to the sensitive soul,[3] and individual thought depends on the understanding or passive nous only, all self-consciousness must cease with death.[4] Nevertheless, a later interpreter[5] maintains that Aristotle, in his dialogistic works (the *Eudemus*), decidedly supported the immortality of the soul, by appealing to the universal custom of sacrifices for the dead and of swearing by them; and, indeed, he does praise the blest departed in a fragment preserved to us of the above dialogue; they are in better case than we, and it would therefore be a sin to give utterance to false and calumnious sayings about them.[6] But whereas in his scientific writings he declares it to be absurd to speak of a blest state of the dead (inconceivable without activity),[7] there can hardly be a doubt left upon the point that he

[1] *Eth. Eudem.* vii. 14,—a passage of the highest importance for the right understanding of the Aristotelian psychology. Add *De. An.* iii. 4, 5; *De sensu*, c. 7.

[2] The *νοῦς φθαρτός*, which Aristotle distinguishes from the *ἄφθαρτος* in the fifth chapter of the third book *De Animâ*.

[3] *De An.* iii. 5; *De Mem.* i.

[4] *De An.* i. 4.

[5] The Armenian David in *Categ.* p. 24, ed. Brandis.

[6] *Ap. Plut. Consol. ad Apoll.* c. 27.

[7] *Eth. Nic.* i. 11.

only spoke exoterically in the *Eudemus*, and was accommodating himself to the ordinary notions.

Thus, then, Aristotle's doctrine of the soul shows that his defect, as well as that of Plato, and indeed of all antiquity, was his imperfect acquaintance with the idea of personality, and on that head he cannot be acquitted of a pantheistic tendency. Nor must we expect any light from him on the cardinal questions of liberty or moral spontaneity, or on the origin and nature of evil. He pronounces decidedly that man is author and master of his own actions, that it rests with himself to be good or bad;[1] and hence he also gainsays the Socratico-Platonic position that no man is voluntarily wicked. He is just as incapable of finding a place for true liberty of the will between the two motions caused by sensual concupiscence and by the divine nous dwelling in the soul. Necessity presses from two sides, from the things which determine the passive (human) understanding, and from the divine nous. Evil is with him only the want of proportion, now an excess, then a defect of the good; and this gave rise to his paradoxical maxim, that evil is no other than good itself in potentia, not in reality;[2] as, that is, all power contains in itself an element of opposition or impotence, from which it endeavours to exempt itself, therefore the bad is precisely this impotence, which is exhibited in the want of proportion, and in not keeping to the middle line between excess and defect. Hence, too, it only shows itself in this world of contingency and change, and has no relationship to God, as the first or absolute good has nothing that is his opposite.[3] One sees the impossibility of discerning the nature of evil, as moral perversion and hostile hindrance of good, here.

There is but one point in his *Ethics* where Aristotle rises, in essentials, above a somewhat higher doctrine of prudence. The end of all moral energy is happiness, consisting in the healthy state arising from activity proportioned to nature, the highest grade of which is to be found in "theoria," in thinking, the function of the divine in man, in fact, in the act of speculative thought, contem-

[1] *Eth. Nic.* iii. 7; *Eth. Eudem.* ii. 6–8.
[2] *Met.* xiv. p. 302. [3] *Ibid.* xi. 10.

plating itself. The standard of moral action is the keeping to the moral mean, and the observance of this right mean between two opposite non-virtues, is virtue. But as pure contemplation is designated as the highest degree of happiness, and therefore as the supreme end, which virtue must subserve as a mean, so there is ever an object lying beyond him, which is held out to man for his efforts, in thus exhorting him to raise himself out of the variety and multiplicity of the earthly to the simplicity of heavenly contemplation. In particulars Aristotle is certainly not without his faults. In his *Politics* he lays a stress upon laws ordering the exposition of, or making away with, weak children, and recommends the use of means for causing abortion.[1] He speaks, as of a fault, of the mercy inclined to pardon an injury received; and, on the contrary, quotes it as a becoming feature in a high-hearted man to be open and unreserved in love as well as in hate.[2]

II. Philosophy and Religion amongst the Greeks from the time of Alexander the Great till the First Century of Christianity

A new period of the world's history arose with the Macedonian-Greek conquest in the East. Then the Greek modes of thought and civilisation began to penetrate deep into the heart of Asia, under the protection of the Macedonian sword, and to produce in the great Oriental kingdoms of the Seleucids in Asia, and of the Ptolemies in Egypt, a process of fermentation, which broke down the steep partition-wall of Asiatic and Egyptian nationalities and popular religions, and which also reacted powerfully upon the Hellenes in their native land. There were now hellenised people in the three quarters of the globe, the educated classes amongst whom studied the Hellenic language and literature; and Hellenic religious rites, images, and festivals had also found an entrance. Alexandria, Antioch on the Orontes, Seleucia on the Euphrates, Tarsus, Pergamus, and Rhodes sprung up as capital seats of this new civilisation, of science and literature

[1] *Polit.* vii. 16. [2] *Eth. Nic.* iv. 11, iv. 8.

becoming daily more universal and encyclopædic; while Hellas herself parted with her primest sons for the numerous colonies of Asia, and sunk progressively, Athens alone, in spite of the loss of her freedom and political importance, remaining the classic spot and school of Greek civilisation and philosophy.

The more that east and west now acted upon one another, and the deeper the Hellenic spirit of inquiry and instincts of assimilation penetrated into the religious traditions, myths, and dogmas of the Babylonian, Syrian, Phenician, Persian, and Egyptian, the greater the impulse seemed likely to prove that would necessarily be given to heathendom. Strict national boundaries were broken down; gods and their religious rites were confused, and not unfrequently seemed to recognise one another as near of kin or identical. If the Greeks since Herodotus were predisposed to rediscover their own deities in foreign ones, and to appropriate to themselves the rites of other nations, this tendency henceforth met with its richest supply; for the policy of Macedonian-Greek dynasties on the east demanded the pulling down of the national partition-wall between Greek and native, and that what separates men most, the opposition of religion, should be harmonised and blended. Then it was the thought may have been entertained of the gradual formation, in this way, of a universal religion of paganism, freed from the trammels of particular nationalities (especially if a philosophy, idealising the concrete forms of gods, did not refuse its co-operation), and that therein it might be possible for all people severally to recognise the essentials of their old hereditary cultus, and to retain, nevertheless, an infinite variety of local and national uses and forms of worship. Besides, for a considerable time previously, the ground had been cleared among the Greeks for a general fusion or "theocrasy" of the kind. On the one hand, the Orphici and Pythagoreans had been continually on the alert to advance their pantheistic theogony, established in a philosophical way with secret orgies, as the only true religion, or at least as the best and most practical, and eminently appropriate for educated folk. With this was connected an attempt to get the Greek gods, now grown up into solid and concrete

personalities, decomposed by allegorical interpretation, or resolved into the three leading Orphic deities, Zeus, Dionysos, and Persephone. On the other hand, philosophers, like Plato and Aristotle, were seeking to insinuate a sidereal meaning in the Hellenic deities; and as Sabæism in foreign religions formed an element of considerably greater importance than in the Hellenic, the strong reaction which the East now exercised upon Hellas could only contribute to the success of this tendency.

Meanwhile it was principally the cultus of Dionysos which commended itself to the inclinations of men in the then state of the world, and became a kind of world religion. The wanton sensuality and the festal pomp of its service, the opportunity that it afforded all arts of combining to glorify the god, the union of thronged and public pageantry with secret orgies and symbols exciting to the imagination, the alternation of purifying rites with unbridled bacchanalian frenzy,—all operated like a potent charm in those centuries of overpowering relaxation and softness. To the Asiatic expeditions of the god recorded by the older sagas, there was added an Indian one, now that Alexander had opened that country, and it was modelled on the basis of ancient Oriental legends. To blend him with Attes, Osiris, and Adonis, and then to append the attributes of a sun-god also, were steps sufficiently obvious.

It had long been a custom with the Greeks to honour renowned or well-deserving men as heroes after their death; but to pay divine honours to the living never entered into their minds in early times; irreligious levity and flattery led to that. As early as the times of the Peloponnesian war, Greek cities erected altars to the Spartan general Lysander, slew victims, and sang poems in his honour; and the inhabitants of Thasos sent ambassadors to acquaint Agesilaus with their intention of consecrating a temple to him, and establishing his worship out of gratitude.[1] Philip of Macedon received divine honours in Amphipolis, and his son, Alexander, made requisition in form to the cities of Greece to acknowledge and invoke him as god. Public assemblies were convoked at Athens on the point; but while the orator Lycurgus indignantly expressed his

[1] Plut. *Lys.* 18; Athen. xv. 52.

disapprobation of the new god, whose temple, he said, no one could leave without needing a purification, Demades and Demosthenes advised the people to comply with the request, that they might not lose the earth while battling with the king about the possession of heaven.[1]

Nevertheless, what the Athenians then accorded reluctantly and on compulsion, they offered spontaneously and with a lavish liberality to Demetrius, one of the Successors, a few years later. He and his father Antigonus were canonised as "saviour-gods." A priest was to minister every year at their altars, and their cultus to be celebrated with processions, sacrifices, and games. Their portraits were inwoven in the peplos of Athene, together with those of the patron deities, and the place where Demetrius first descended from his chariot was hallowed by the erection of an altar to "Demetrius the descending," an epithet otherwise peculiar to Zeus alone, as lord of the thunderbolt. As often as he came to Athens he was to be welcomed with the solemnities fixed for the reception of Dionysos and Demeter.[2] Athens did not stand alone. Sicyon deified *the* Attalus, who distributed corn to her;[3] and even Aratus, the founder of the Achæan league, set up the Antigonist festival to Antigonus, son of Demetrius, and sang the pæan to him, *i.e.* the hymn appropriate to Apollo the deliverer only.[4]

What was now so readily and profusely done for the living, came naturally to be awarded to the dead also without hesitation; and simple heroic honours, such as Cimon received after his death at Cyprus, Brasidas in Amphipolis, and Euphron in Sicyon, were no longer sufficient.[5] Alexander's general, Harpalus, built a temple to a common prostitute, Pythionice, under the title of the Pythionic Aphrodite.[6] Alexander having himself commanded the invocation of his deceased favourite, Hephæstion, a rivalry ensued among the different cities in erecting temples and altars to the new god, and observing feasts in his honour, and the oath by his

[1] Athen. ii. 22; Demosth. *Epist.* iii. 29; Plut. *Reip. ger. Pr.* 8.
[2] Plut. *Demetr.* 23–26; Athen. vi. 62–64.
[3] Polyb. xvii. 16. 3.
[4] Plut. *Cleomen.* 16.
[5] Plut. *Cim. extr.*; Thucyd. v. 11; Xen. *Hell.* vii. 3.
[6] Athen. xiii. 67.

name was held the most sacred. Dreams, in which he had revealed himself, oracles he had imparted, and diseases he had healed, were reported in numbers. Examples of such apotheoses of living and dead became daily more frequent. In Rhodes, Ptolemy, while still alive, received the honour of invocation. Even his wife, Berenice, became a goddess; and the birth of his son, Ptolemy Philadelphus, was solemnised as if it had been that of an Olympic god.[1] Later on, the deputies of the Achæan league put the name of the younger Philip of Macedon next after those of Zeus, Apollo, and Hercules;[2] and when the Roman rulers arrived, apotheoses had become almost an established homage, which was not likely to be withheld from these new possessors of power; on the contrary, it came now to be practised in gross.

In times which saw such gods arise and pass away like fungi, as evidences of frivolous belief and slavish adulation, the thought might easily occur, that even those old gods of the Greeks, highly extolled and glorified by poetry as they were, might once upon a time have originated in a similar way, and that Zeus and the other Olympians were nothing but men deified by men. It was Euhemerus of Messana in Sicily, a friend of the Macedonian king Cassander, and contemporary and intellectual ally of Epicurus, who (about the year 300 B.C.) introduced this notion to the world with such prodigious talents of invention and representation, that he produced a powerful and lasting effect, and, as Plutarch expressed it, spread godlessness far and wide over the face of the earth. Ionic logographers and explainers of myths had paved the way for him, by converting myths into history: the Cretan legend, that Zeus was born and buried in the island, served him as the point of attack. An island in the far east, Panchæa, accounts furnished by priests, and a host of inscriptions from tombs and monuments of deceased gods, which he had met with in his travels in Asia, were supposed to have unveiled to him all the mysteries of the Greek religious world. In sooth, all the gods, beginning with Ouranos and Cronos, were men; and their acts were narrated by Euhemerus, like the history of the royal succession in a country. Zeus was,

[1] Theocr. *Id.* xvii. 16 sqq. 46.

[2] *Liv.* xxxii. 35.

of course, a mighty monarch of primitive time, who had five times travelled the earth round, and, by a combination of artifice and power, had subjected mankind to his yoke, and induced them to invoke him. Euhemerus dealt still worse with the characters of some others of the gods. Aphrodite, his story was, had first practised public prostitution for a livelihood; Cadmus had been a cook; and Harmonia was a dancing-woman of a king of Sidon, whom he carried off.[1]

The bad reception this work met with from favourers of the existing religious system, is shown by Callimachus among others. This Alexandrine calls Euhemerus "the hoary liar who scribbled shameful books, and invented the Zeus, the old king of Panchæa."[2] He was styled the godless, a man who had annihilated all religion.[3] And yet he was not a real atheist; he acknowledged a class of gods eternal and imperishable, such as Helios and Selene;[4] and Zeus himself, according to his story, had once offered sacrifice to Ether, and to him only. Hecatæus of Abdera, a contemporary of Euhemerus, living at the court of Ptolemy, wrote, it appears, with similar views, his description of the pious and priestly Hyperboreans, entirely devoted to the service of Apollo, with their holy city, and the wonderful cultus of hymns they offered to the god, with the aid of a choir of swans.[5] Indeed, the dawning picture of a pious race, serving but one deity, might well be held up to the confusion of the polytheistic Hellenes.

In philosophy the disinclination, or rather the hostile opposition, to the popular religion came out with increasing energy, the more that, in the march of political and religious downfall, the earlier reserve was no longer necessarily practised, nor were sentences of condemnation so easy to be incurred as in the times of Anaxagoras. The case of the philosopher Stilpo, whom the Areopagus exiled from Athens, about the year 306, for asserting that the Athene of Phidias was no god, is an isolated one. The fact that

[1] Diodor. v. 41–46; Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* ii. 2. 4; Enn. *Fragm.* ed. Hessel, pp. 315–326; Minuc. Fel. xxi. 2; Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* ix. 17; Plut. *Isid.* 23

[2] *Ap. Plut. de Plac. Phil.* i. 7.

[3] Cic. *N. D.* i. 42.

[4] Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* ii. 2; Lact. i. 11. 65.

[5] Fragm. in Müller's *Fragm. Hist. Græc.* ii. 286 sqq.

the Epicurean school quietly made head, and propagated itself at Athens, is a proof that the old vigilant jealousy for the state religion there was extinct. In the courts of Alexandria and Pergamus, where philosophers were kindly welcomed, there was still less to be found on this score.

The elder Peripatetics had already deviated from their master Aristotle from a more materialist tendency, and an effort to make physical causes only pass current. Dicæarchus denied the immortality of the soul. The thing called soul was merely a certain state of the body, something not distinguishable from the physical vital power.[1] Yet, like Aristotle, he recognised a divine principle in which man had part, though he appears to have considered it a purely transient communication, and not as an immortal germ dwelling in him.[2] Strato of Lampsacus, who received the surname of the Physicist, as representing this tendency, departed still further from his master's teaching, and returned to the point of view chosen by Archelaus and also that of Democritus, though he rejected the atomic doctrine of the latter. That prime moving cause on which Aristotle had made all life and all activity in the world depend, Strato excluded from all relation to it. He required no god, he said, to build the world: yet it appears he did not intend by that to deny the existence of a divine being, but only all its influence upon nature. The powers already in her, and at work spontaneously, were fully sufficient to account for all life and motion.[3] Comparing the statement that he designated the hot substance, ether, as the cause of all,[4] with what he taught about the soul, the result is, that, like Dicæarchus, he discovered in all souls qualities or forms of existence merely corporeal, or inseparable from bodies, which, in fact, were inherent in that fifth element, as received by the Peripatetics, the subtlest of material substances, or ether. In this respect this school paved the way for Epicurism as well as for Stoicism; and it

[1] Sext. Emp. *Hypot.* ii. 31; *adv. Math.* xxxvii. 349; Cic. *Tusc.* i. 10; Attic. *ap. Eus. Præp. Evang.* xv. 9.

[2] Plut. *Plac. Phil.* v. 1; Cic. *Div.* i. 3.

[3] Cic. *Acad.* ii. 28. This passage can only be understood of Strato having assumed a deity distinct from nature.

[4] Epiph. in *Syntomo, Opp.* i. 1090, Petav.

cannot be matter of astonishment, now that people had only physics in the stead of metaphysics, that speculative activity should have thenceforward fallen into disuse, and retired in favour of rhetoric and the special learned professions.

The Peripatetic Theophrastus had maintained, in unison quite with the later spirit of his school, that life was ruled by accident and not by wisdom, and that perfection and happiness depend entirely on the caprices of a blind destiny and the contingencies of external circumstances.[1] This last axiom of the last speculative school of importance, and declaration of intellectual insolvency, created immense sensation, and, for a long time, formed a theme much discussed in books and lecture-rooms. It was unmistakably an echo of this view of life which issued from all systems and schools thenceforward, extolling the absence of unrest and excitement (apathy and ataraxy) as the highest aim for the wise man to pursue. Greek philosophy, shut up in the horizon of a nature that was left to itself, and, for this very reason, failing to secure that solid centre of rest which can alone impart steadiness and certainty to human thought, now sunk and became impoverished. She had no more to offer to the deepest requirements of the human intellect, the religious ones. In morals she assumed a merely negative character, as in the just-mentioned tendency; in physics she had naturally reached again the overwhelming result of a world-mechanism devoid of God, and self-moving from eternity; and here again was a challenge to the inquiring spirit to withdraw itself from nature and retire within itself. Thus was aroused, on the one side, a sceptical tendency, starting from distrust of all previous systems and observation, and advancing to the systematic denial of all objective truth and certainty; and, on the other hand, eclectic systems were framed. These expedients were resorted to, partly in the interests of a close connection with positive religion, now again discovered to be indispensable, and so gave birth to Stoicism; and, in part also, with the contradictory view of extirpating religious sentiment,—fear and reverential awe of the gods,—out of man's head and heart, and

[1] Cic. *Tusc.* v. 9.

thence resulted Epicurism. A remarkable saying of Epicurus shows how strongly this was the tendency of his fundamental idea: "If fear of the gods and of death were not, we might do perfectly well without physics."

THE STOIC DOCTRINE

Zeno of Cittium in Cyprus (340–260 B.C.), after hearing at Athens the teachers of the different Socratic schools for the space of twenty years, when now he had reached a mature manhood, and was in general estimation on account of his strictly moral and temperate mode of life, became the founder of a school of his own. His long intercourse with members of the Cynic school gave his doctrine an exceedingly strong savour of Cynicism. The Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy seemed to him too one-sidedly speculative, and too great a distance from the sphere of the positive and of practical life. He disdained founding a school of *savants* and initiated, but desired that a host of virtuous men should issue from his popular doctrine, which was accessible to the common capacity of mankind. Seneca indicated his relation to the Socratic school by saying that the Cynics had travelled beyond nature, but Zeno was content to subdue her. At present, however, it is impossible to distinguish any longer what is peculiar to him from the later Stoic system as matured by others. All we know is, that he recommended the regarding all who were not wise, in the Stoic sense, as strangers, enemies, and slaves; and that in his politics he advised a community of wives; and thought temples, courts of justice, gymnasia, and the use of money ought not to be tolerated in the Stoic model republic.[1]

The Stoic system is utter materialism, built upon Heraclitic doctrine. It adopted corporeal causes only, and is only acquainted with two principles,—matter, and an activity resident in matter, from eternity, as power, and giving it form. Everything real is body; there are no incorporeal things, as our abstractions, space, time, etc., have merely an existence in our thoughts; so all that

[1] Diog. Laert. vii. 32, 33, 131.

really exists can only be known through the senses. The Stoics also rejected the Platonic ideas, as well as the incorporeal immaterial substance of Aristotle; the one as well as the other being, in their eyes, simple abstractions of human thought.

In fact, the two principles, matter and power, are to the Stoics but one and the same thing viewed in different relations. Matter required for its existence a principle of unity to give it form and keep it together; and this, the active element, is inconceivable without matter, as a subject in and on which it exists and dwells, and in which it works and moves. Thus, the positive element is matter, yet conceived without properties; the active one, running through and quickening all, is God in matter. But, in truth, God and matter are identical; in other words, the Stoic doctrine is hylozoic pantheism. God, forsooth, is the unity of power, embracing the whole universe, permeating all, assuming all forms, and, as such, a subtle fluid, fire, ether, or spirit, whereby the Stoics understood a fifth element, for which air served as the material basis.[1] This ethereal, igneous power comprises by anticipation all modes of existence which the world-body, that it quickens, can assume. These are developed regularly out of it, and it lives and moves in all, and is the common source of all aspiration and desire.

God is, therefore, the world-soul, and the world itself no aggregate of independent elements, but an organised, living being, whose complement and life is a single soul, or primal fire, exhibiting divers degrees of expansion and heat. According to the Aristotelian theory, the world is an aggregate of individual beings only connected by a community of effort to attain a higher end: according to the Stoic, collective things are members of an organism in perfection surpassing all, and, as members, so strongly bound up one with the other, that nothing can happen to the individual being which does not by sympathy extend its effect to all the rest. God, then, in his physical aspect, is the world-fire, or vital heat, all-penetrating, the one only cause of all life and all motion, and, at the same time, the necessity

[1] Diog. Laert. vii. 137, 148, 156; Plut. *Plac. Phil.* i. 7; Cic. *N. D.* ii. 11 sqq.

that rules in the world: but, on the other side, as the universal cause can only be a soul full of intelligence and wisdom, he is the world-intelligence, a blest being, and the author of the moral law, who is ever occupied with the government of the world, although he is precisely this world itself.

Thus all is subjected to the law of absolute necessity, all is from eternity determined by an infinite chain of foregone causes,—for nothing happens without cause,—and each is again the effect of a previous one; hence, what is called accident, or seems to be so, is only the effect of a cause unknown to us.[1] Consequently the will of man is a mere spontaneity. He wills, but it is inevitable he should so will; he determines himself, but the determination is the result of precedent causes; and, as here each cause is a something subjected to the conditions of matter, and purely of the inner world, all therefore turns into immutable destiny: but in so far as the concatenation of causes leads back to a first cause, and this first cause unites intelligence to its physical aspect, all being thus foreseen and determined in it—so far can that which, viewed on the side of its immutable necessity, is called fate, or destiny, be conceived as thought, and be termed providence or divine disposition.[2]

As with Heraclitus, so with the Stoics, it is the fire-matter, or centre of vital heat, from which all motion proceeds, and which, by virtue of its purity and capacity of motion, is, at the same time, infinite intelligence. All is either the deity itself, or a form adopted by it. The one substance is God and nature together, of which all that comes into being and ceases to be, all generation and dissolution, are mere modifications. Seneca explains Zeus or God's being at once the world and the world's soul by pointing to man, who feels himself to be a single being, and yet again as one consisting of two substances, body and soul.[3]

The all-god is to be honoured, not only in his unity,

[1] Cic. *de Fato*, c. 6 sqq.; *De Divin.* i. 55; Alex. Aphrod. *de Fato*, Lond. 1658, p. 103; Plut. *de Plac. Phil.* i. 27.

[2] Plut. *adv. Stoic.* 36; Cic. *N. D.* ii. 65; Diog. Laert. vii. 134.

[3] *Epist.* 113.

but also in his parts. The stars, the round earth, the sea, the streams, too, as fragments of the world-god, are themselves, again, gods, for they contain a greater or less quantity of ethereal fire-matter. The stars, as gods of the second rank, fix by their motions the destinies of inferior beings along with necessity,[1] but are themselves perishable. In the great conflagration which takes place after the expiration of a world-period or "great year," all organised beings will be destroyed, these gods disappear, all multiplicity and difference be lost in God's unity; which means, all will become ether again. But forthwith, like the phœnix recovering life from his own ashes, the formation of the world begins afresh; God transforms himself once more by a general renovation into a world, in which the same events, under similar circumstances, are again to be repeated down to the minutest detail. Many of these great catastrophes have already happened, and the process of burning by fire will follow again upon this regeneration, and so on *ad infinitum*.[2]

Everything in the world is directed to the best end. Hence the Stoics, too, considered the teleological proof of the being of God as the main one. The opposition of good and bad in the order of the world is necessary as shadow to light, and evil, therefore, is quite conformable to divine providence. As in this system God and necessity are one, all ethics become physics, and Zeus is the impelling thought from which all motions, and therefore those of evil also, issue; thus evil must be conceived not as act of human freedom, while God, the originator of life, is at the same time the effective cause of corruption. Even acts of vice, Chrysippus said, are movements of universal nature, and in conformity with the divine intelligence. In the economy of the great world, evil is like chaff falling,—as unavoidable and worthless.[3] Evil also was said by this school to do the service of making the good known, and yet at last all must resolve itself into God.

[1] Cic. *N. D.* ii. 15; *Acad. Quæst.* ii. 37; Plut. *de Stoic. Rep.* p. 1052; *adv. Stoic.* p. 1075.

[2] Plut. *de Orac. def.* pp. 415, 425; Numen. *ap. Eus. Præp. Evang.* 15. 19; M. Aurel. vii. 19; Nemes. *Nat. hom.* c. 38.

[3] Plut. *de St. Rep.* c. 34.

But while the whole of the physical and theological teachings of the Stoics tended to such misapprehension of evil as sin, and to the abolition of liberty, their ethico-practical tendency on the other side called for the adoption of the principle, that there still were things within our power and control. Epictetus enumerated among these the interior operations of judging, of desire, and of antipathy. "There is no one to rob us of our will,"[1] said he; and the Stoic paradox—that Zeus and man, so far as both are wise, advance one another's interests—seems to express a certain independence in man. Here, then, was an unsolved antinomy, the existence of which men thenceforward suffered; if an attempt was made to solve it, the solution turned to the favour of human bondage and of determinism.

Chrysippus, in one of his own works, made the most important attempt at striking a balance.[2] He enlarged on the point, that the co-operation of man in the great economy of the world was already determined, and that accordingly man had an active part in the execution of predestination. This part, so as to be consistent with the system, could indeed only be conceived as itself equally predestined, and just as much unable to withdraw himself from it. If, then, the Stoics called that which was an individual man's very own his "demon," as a benign particular providence working in and watching over him, and in their ethics required that the demon of the individual should harmonise with Zeus, as conductor of the universe;[3] this ethical postulate, on their part, was at the same time an expression of a law of necessity, infallibly carrying itself into execution. "Necessity, fate, leads the willing, draws the repugnant." To yield rightly to necessity is wisdom;[4] for, as Cleanthes said, "Were I to become bad, and not to follow the conduct of Zeus and of necessity, I should follow it notwithstanding." Resistance, therefore, interior but always fruitless, is in man's power; but his acts, as always and anyhow included in the concatenation of things, are absolutely due and owing to the law of predestined

[1] Plut. *de Comm. Stoic. Not.* c. 33.

[2] Περὶ εἱμαρμένης: cf. *Diogenian. ap. Eus. Pr. Evg.* vi. 8; Cic. *de Fato*, c. 13.

[3] Diog. Laert.

[4] *Epist. Ench.* c. 53.

necessity. No other school of Greek philosophy has dwelt at such length, and with so great an outlay of moral earnestness and sagacity, upon the great problem of liberty as the Stoic has; they entered further into it than even Plato or Aristotle; one sees notwithstanding how it was their physics which damaged their ethics in the long-run.

What is the human soul, then, in this system? All creatures, the Stoa taught, are more or less perfect; nay, in proportion as the ethereal principle in them, mixed with grosser matter, is more or less, that matter has either the upper hand, or is subject to it: even in stone there is still a binding power, keeping it together, *i.e.* the igneous spirit. The soul of man is of similar substance, therefore breath or fire, like the world-soul, of which it is a part; but in man it manifests itself at the same time as the power from which knowledge and conduct spring, and as intelligence, will, and self-consciousness. It is thereby closer allied to the divine nature, yet is also a corporeal being, acting on the body and the body on it. It is caloric, united with the blood, and imparting life and motion;[1] it is perishable, though it lasts out the body, perhaps till the burning of the world. Under the most favourable circumstances, then, it has the duration of a world-period; but on the expiration of this period, it must return into the universal ether, or the deity.[2] Its individual being and consciousness has an end. Later Stoics, Marcus Aurelius for instance, make souls fly back into the world some time after death. Seneca, on the contrary, adopted a purification of them after death.[3] Here there was in the very heart of the school a department of mere opinion and conjecture. Chrysippus thought that the souls of the wise only, as being the stronger, would exist on after death. Others taught that souls generally, or at least the purified, raised themselves by their lightness into the region of the stars, the spherical shape of which they then assumed, as Chrysippus said.[4]

[1] Cleanth. *ap. Nemes nat. hom.* p. 35; Chrysipp. *ibid.*; Diog. Laert. vii. 156; Stob. *Ecl.* i. 796.

[2] Plut. *Plac. Phil.* iv. 7; *Non posse suav. vivi sec. Epic.* 31; Cic. *Tusc.* i. 31.

[3] M. Aur. ii. 17, v. 4; Sen. *Cons ad Marc.* c. 25.

[4] Cic. *Tusc.* i. 18; Eustath. *ad Iliad.* xxiii. 65; Arius, *Did. ap. Eus. Pr. Evg.* xv. 20.

The attitude of the Stoic school towards the popular religion was like that of Plato, at once exculpatory and inculpatory. The Stoics granted that religion, on the whole, swarming with invented gods, false doctrines, and wild superstition, presented so pitiable an appearance,[1] that one was obliged to treat the mass of absurd fables with contempt; yet they taught it was well to retain the names of gods once consecrated by public opinion, which were only designations for certain embodiments of the one world-god. Temples, indeed, ought not, in reality, to have been erected; but as they were there, they ought to be entered with reverence because of the people.[2]

The masters of the school, Zeno, Cleanthes, and Chrysippus, tried to adapt a part of the myths to their system by allegorico-physical explanations.[3] They could do this the easier, as they had room in it for an indefinite number of created gods; stars, elements, fruits, wine, and other gifts of nature, being so many repositories or manifestations of divine power, to style these gods came easy to them. They could adapt themselves comfortably to hero-worship and invocation of deified men; for every soul of man is a part of the deity.[4] Epictetus says, God observes every emotion of our souls, for he is the same nature with them, and they belong to him. When we take food and move, we should think it is a god we are supplying with food and motion, and that we always carry a god about with us. Marcus Aurelius expresses the same thought in this fashion: "God has assigned every man a demon, or genius (the soul), for his conductor; and this spirit is a portion of himself that he has parted with."[5]

The Stoics also took under their protection the divination of the day, and attempted to explain it by their theory of the world. There is, they said, an ascertained natural connection between prognostications and the events they announce, the sign and that which is signified, as the whole of nature is in principle a single being sympathetically

[1] Cic. *N. D.* ii. 28.
[2] Plut. *Stoic. Rep.* p. 1034; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. p. 691.
[3] Cic. *N. D.* iii. 24.
[4] Μόρια καὶ ἀποσπάσματα Θεοῦ, Epictetus says, *Diss.* i. 14.
[5] Epict. *Diss.* ii. 8. 2; M. Aurel. v. 27.

strung together, and the individual lives in, and along with, the universe. The ability to interpret these signs is partly a natural talent, and may partly be educated and increased by art. As the divine power, or ethereal matter, is spread over the whole world, and circulates in everything, oracles, signs, dreams, and all kinds of divination are all perfectly natural, yet divine, and the strongest proofs of a divine providence; which, for example, guides the priest sacrificing to select the very beast in whose entrails afterwards the sign desired is found.[1]

Stoic morals are based upon an axiom, also received in the Aristotelian system, that knowledge and action are identical; but they make this action consist in the tension of a subtle body, at once thinking and willing. Knowledge, then, is the product of the will, throwing the soul into tension or activity; consequently it is an art and a virtue; this energy of the will, again, according to the determinism of the school, is itself a product of the necessity lying in the universal concatenation of things. Thus, in order to will the good, it is enough to know it perfectly and in every case. This proves decidedly that the Stoics could not have assumed, as Plato did, opposite tendencies and yearnings in the elements composing man's nature. Nature and intelligence to them are one. Hence Zeno discovered in the individual virtues only different names of one leading and universal virtue, intuition or prudence (phronesis).[2] Passions, said the Stoics, are judgments, piety is knowledge of the worship of God;[3] and as all faults and transgressions are only the result of mistake, the Stoics could excuse them as, in a certain degree, involuntary.[4]

True to their pantheistic theory of the world, the Stoics placed the highest good and end in natural proportion. Already had the Academics, and Polemo in particular, put this forward as the highest good. Conformity with oneself, they said, is at the same time consonance with nature and reason. Virtue solves this problem, because she, as the art of life, makes of human life an artistic work instead of a

[1] Cic. *Div.* i. 18. 55–57; Plut. *Plac. Phil.* v. 1.
[2] Cic. *de Fin.* iii. 7. 21; *Tusc.* v. 23.
[3] Diog. Laert. vii. 111, 119.
[4] Sen. *de Benef.* v. 17; *de Ira*, i. 14: cf. ii. 9, 10.

product of natural spontaneity, and attunes the individual life to the general order of the world,[1] while happiness is in perfect harmony with virtue. According to this view, there is but one virtue, only with a different name as the circumstances and situations of life are different: whoever, then, has one virtue, has all. It must, however, be added, that whoever is stained by one vice is in the grasp of all, and this is true of both virtue and vice in the highest degree. For virtue is identical with reason, and must be simple and absolute as it; and it is as little possible there should be any middle thing between virtue and vice conceded, as between truth and error, wisdom and folly.[2] For this very reason, too, virtue alone is perfectly sufficient to happiness.

Upon this theory Stoic ethics now projected the ideal of the genuine wise man, who, possessing understanding, science, and virtue, in their perfection, without prejudices as without passions, knows all things with an infallible certainty, has all things, can lose nothing of his own, is alone free, needs nothing to complete his happiness, and through his reason identifies himself with the universal reason, God, destiny; so that he wills what the other does, and nothing can befall him which he has not approved of beforehand, and accepted with unconditional resignation.[3]

Nevertheless from this height, on which the truly wise converses with men like a hidden god, and in his undisturbed tranquillity and apathy knows himself to be as great, perfect, and blest, as Zeus,[4] Stoicism descends again by compulsion. Holding, as it does, every unwise man to be an unhappy madman, and unwise every one is who does not confess the Stoic system, still it allows its inability to name a single person who has realised this perfect type of the wise man: not Socrates, not Antisthenes; no one of the three Stoic chiefs, Zeno, Cleanthes, or Chrysippus, has represented it; once only in the oldest times it has produced one such wise man, now forgotten for good, and whom one can no longer distinguish.[5] Hence the wise man should,

[1] Zeno, *ap. Stob. Ecl.* ii. 132; Sen. *Ep.* 89; Diog. Laert. vii. 87, 88.
[2] Diog. Laert. vii. 127; Sen. *Ep.* 74.
[3] Epict. *Diss.* iii. 26: comp. *Lipsii Manud. ad Stoic. Philos.* iii. 9.
[4] Plut. *Stoic. Rep.* 13; *adv. Stoic.* 33.
[5] Alex. Aphrod. *de Fato*, p. 130; Stob. *Ecl.* ii. 236.

and must, accommodate himself to circumstances, as in the present state of things, and with so many unwise about one, that ideal is not easily attainable. Employing a prudent "economy,"[1] he must, and shall, condescend to the multitude; in so doing he only does what God himself does, in descending to the lower forms of existence: he can accommodate his speech without hesitation to the ideas of the ignorant mass without lying. But generally the wise man, who bears within him the consciousness of his godlike nature and righteousness, is high placed above all human law and custom. And so the rigorism of the Stoic morality strikes into the most unbounded caprice of the individual. The wise man is to himself the law of the good; whilst he follows his nature, he is following the divine reason. In one word, there is no one human law objective to him and independent of him. With him the end rectifies the means; what he does is good and perfect, for the reason that he does it. Ataraxia, philosophical impassibility, which assures the clear knowledge of the good, and along with it, self-evidently, this good itself, or all virtue, is itself in Stoic eyes the highest virtue; all turns on his preserving or regaining this repose, and no price is too high for it. Thus if he feels it is not the suppression, but the satisfaction, of a passion which is the right and natural way for him to secure to his divine nature the possession of ataraxia; and on this ground he can allow himself in everything, reconcile himself to law and custom, or set them aside,—lying, paiderastia, the profession of unchastity, and even things at the contemplation of which nature shudders, the deeds of an Œdipus or a Thyestes,—all is allowable to him.[2] The three masters of the Stoa are agreed with the Cynic school, that the vice of paiderastia is a thing indifferent in itself.[3] Zeno even had no hesitation in allowing himself this indulgence. Chrysippus actually extols the disgusting shamelessness of Diogenes; and if the school raised conformity to nature into the first principle of their morality, the fact that

[1] This word seems first to have received from the Stoics the meaning which it has retained ever since: cf. Stob. *Ecl.* ii. 130.

[2] Stob. *Ecl.* ii. 118, 230, 238; Plut. *Stoic. Rep.* 22; Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* xi. 193 sqq.; Diog. Laert. vii. 188.

[3] Sext. Emp. *Hypot.* iii. 200.

adultery and incestuous confusion of sex among nearest blood relations, even parents and children, was further held to be conformable to nature,[1] shows how wide and elastic this principle was with them.

The admissibility of suicide was a view much discussed amongst the Stoics; they asserted that in many cases it was not only allowable but a duty to take one's life. Zeno's opinion was, that any grievous or irremediable bodily suffering authorised it.[2] Even in the writings of the strictest Stoic moralists there is much talk of the doors being always open through which, when life becomes too burdensome, man may make his exit, just as one leaves a house filled with smoke. Suicide was cried up as the unfailing and universal remedy for all evil;[3] and Marcus Aurelius himself laid it down as a demand of reason, that if a man could not regulate his life freely at his own good pleasure, he might make an end of it.[4] Many wise men of the school put this doctrine into practice on themselves, as Plutarch testifies; amongst others, Zeno and Cleanthes.[5]

THE EPICUREAN SYSTEM

Zeno's contemporary, Epicurus (342–270 B.C.), was probably of an Athenian family in Samos, and received greater honours from his followers after death than the other did. In antiquity generally there was no school of philosophy that has approached the Epicurean in enthusiastic reverence for a master so little thought of during life. Many centuries after his death they carried his picture everywhere about with them, and generally had it hung up in preference to others in their bedrooms. His birthday was celebrated with sacrifices, and every month a festival was held in his honour.[6] Slavishly and to the very letter did they cling to his principles, and to mix any new doctrine with their traditional one, "those holy heaven-sent mysteries," passed with them for a very sacrilege.[7]

[1] Sext. Emp. *Hypot.* iii. 200, 245; *adv. Math.* xi. 190.
[2] Diog. Laert. vii. 130.
[3] Epict. *Diss.* i. 25. 2, ii. 1. 3, i. 24. 4.
[4] M. Aurel. v. 9, viii. 47, x. 8. 32.
[5] Plut. *adv. Stoic.* p. 1063.
[6] Plin. *H. N.* xxxv. 2; Cic. *de Fin.* v. 1.
[7] Numen. *ap. Eus. Pr. Evg.* xiv. 5; Metrod. *ap. Plut. adv. Colot.* p. 1117.

The system of Epicurus had for its basis the Cyrenaic doctrine blended with the atomism of Democritus: it was eminently ethical in a yet higher degree than the Stoic, to which it stood in most decided opposition; all is subordinated to the great end of ataraxia. Philosophy with Epicurus is an operation which transfers the soul into a state of repose and happiness by ideas and arguments. To it belonged physics, as that science removed the great obstacle to human contentment, the fear of the gods and of death;[1] but physics stood in need of the "canonical science," or the law of thought, teaching one to distinguish the true from the false, and which, by the way, in the case of Epicurus was limited to a few simple axioms, as he had renounced dialectics. Sensual experience is the only theoretical pleasure, and the unpleasant the only practical principle of knowledge. Even in sensual illusions the mistake lies not in the sensual perception, which rather is always and alone true, but only in our judgments about them; the momentary sensual impression is thus the only immediate certainty, and therefore should be the only standard of our conduct. In a word, Epicurus professed the grossest empiricism; of science proper there could not be question in his case.[2]

To this "canonical" method the physics of Epicurus corresponded, and here the mechanic and atomistic doctrines of Democritus must have presented themselves at once as most convenient for his purpose; for they cut all supernatural causes clear away, and every interference of the gods in the things of this world, and all assumption of a providence, most effectually. Since according to the old axiom, already in reality refuted by Aristotle, "nothing comes out of nothing, and nothing passes away into nothing," all bodies—and other than corporeal beings there are none—must originally have come into existence out of atoms moving in the void. These primal materials are from eternity and indestructible, without quality, but not without quantity, and are infinitely various in form; from their agglomeration and combination every bodily thing has come into being. The teaching of Democritus

[1] Diog. Laert. x. 80–82; 142, 143.

[2] *Ibid.* x. 31–33; Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* i. 57, xi. 21, vii. 203.

was here somewhat modified; for since the atoms, from their mere gravity and momentum, would be falling in the infinitely empty space, without ever encountering one another, like the drops of a continuous rain, Epicurus accordingly invented a third power to help to make them deviate as they fell in an invisible degree from the perpendicular; and this sufficed to bring about a meeting and accumulation of atoms some time or other. That this once ensued, and that therewith the formation of the universe out of countless worlds of the utmost variety was begun, is absolutely an effect of accident.[1] A single departure from the course of nature, determined by nothing and with no clearer explanation ever vouchsafed, had thus to explain everything. If Strato's world was a vegetating plant, and Zeno's world an intelligent beast, the world of Epicurus was a machine, made by chance and always wound up again in the same way. All these worlds thus produced, and having between them empty intermundia, are still, according to the same system, transitory and perishable from the succession of atoms flying off and flying to. As for any regular order and higher conduct of the universe, it is as little to be thought of as a law of necessity, by which the phenomena of nature are repeated. The same phenomenon, sunrise for instance, may sometimes have one, sometimes another cause. For a law would lead in the end to a lawgiver, and that again might awaken fear, and trouble the repose of the wise man. The same view prevented Epicurus regarding the stars, as they were otherwise held to be in antiquity, as things possessed of souls, and pursuing their revolutions with a will and a consciousness.[2]

Thus, then, there is no room anywhere in the universe for anything extraordinary. The mechanical concatenation of causes can no more be interrupted by any kind of unknown power or mysterious influence; all results from material corporeal causes, while bodies acquire only the mathematical properties of size and form, through which they are capable neither of activity nor of passivity. Thus all can be foreseen and explained. One can now

[1] Diog. Laert. x. 41, 44.

[2] *Ibid.* x. 76, 77; Lact. *Div. Inst.* iii. 17; Lucret. iv. 335, 336.

understand how Epicurus came to be prized by his followers as the greatest benefactor of mankind, as the second Hercules, who has annihilated all monsters,[1] when one has calculated the enormous strength of heathen superstition, which, with its signs and prognostics, with its terror of deities and powers offended without motive, domineered over the whole of life. There could be no injustice in the Epicurean poet saying, while he looked at the state of the case from this point of view:

> "Humana ante oculos fœdè quum vita jaceret,
> In terris oppressa gravi sub religione,
> Quæ caput e cœli regionibus ostendebat,
> Horribili super aspectu mortalibus instans;
> Primum Graius homo," etc.[2]

The soul, according to this school, is a body composed of the finest round and fiery atoms, which, like heated air, penetrates the whole human frame in the most rapid motion; while, again, its subtlest portion, the sensitive and thinking spirit, making a fourth and nameless element (in addition to the three other components, the igneous, airy, and vapourlike), dwells in the cavity of the breast. All passions and instincts take root in these elements of the soul. In heat lies the basis of anger, in the warm air that of repose and cheerfulness, and so on; and the temperament of man is adjusted by the prevalence of one or other of these soul-materials.[3] We must not, however, overlook the fact, that materialistic as is the psychology of Epicurus, and although the two, soul and spirit, only make one thing together, still a certain liberty and independence is attributed to the spirit in contradistinction to the other constituent parts of man. He may be healthy and cheerful, while the body and the unintelligent soul are sick, and *vice versâ*. Epicurus expressed himself about the faculty of perception as Democritus did; it takes place thus, he thought: atoms detach themselves from the surface of the body, and these again penetrate our frame through the instrumentality of the senses, and so produce conceptions of things in us.[4]

[1] Lucr. vi. 195, 379–422.
[2] *Ibid.* i. 62 sqq.
[3] Stob. *Ecl. Phys.* p. 798; Diog. L. x. 66; Lucr. iii. 259–325.
[4] Diog. L. x. 46–50; Lucr. iv. 35–269.

If, then, death destroys the body, the shelter and abode of soul-atoms, these evaporate away, being exposed to the pressure of displacing influences; and that the soul does not survive the death of the body is self-evident. Epicurus attached the greater value to this part of his system, as man's only preservative against the greatest impediment to blissful repose and undisturbed enjoyment of life, the anxious dread of the lower world and punishment after death.[1] If elsewhere man is spoken of as born of heavenly seed,[2] all that was meant was, that he has ethereal matter within him, with the production of which the gods must have just as little to do as with that of the world. Beasts and men are, if anything, products of the earth, still in the vigour of its youth.[3]

Although in the world of Epicurus everything originated and happened without the interference of gods, yet he by no means intended to deny the existence of such beings; for the fact of this notion being so generally entertained by mankind did not admit of explanation unless there were a reality corresponding to it. Man knows of them as having often discovered themselves to him in sleep; they have been seen in dreams and visions, and so they really are beings in human form, but with subtle, ethereal, transparent, and indestructible bodies, enjoying a blest repose in the intermundia, nor busy nor troubled about anything, and only contemplating their own excellencies. They are composed of atoms, but not affected by the powers of motion in them, their flying off and to, but continually, eternally reposing in the universal alternation of coming into, and passing away from, existence. These gods cannot be fewer in number than mortals; indeed, they are countless.[4] They have certainly nothing in common with the gods whom the people believe in. Epicurus said that he who accepted such gods, not he who denied them, was godless. To destroy the popular belief, and with it to eradicate the error of a providence, with the whole apparatus of signs, and interpretation of signs, oracles, etc., from men's minds,

[1] Epic. *ap. Diog. L.* x. 124–127.
[2] Lucr. ii. 990–998.
[3] *Ibid.* v. 770 sqq.
[4] *Ap. Diog. L.* x. 121–124; Sext. Emp. *Hypot.* iii. 219; Cic. *N. D.* i. 17 sqq.

was the idea which swayed him strongest, the problem the solution of which seemed to him the most brilliant triumph philosophy could look forward to.[1] He and his school were acquainted with religion only under the form of fear. To deliver from this fear, and save the human race from the painful nightmare of religious anxiety and dread oppressing it, he deemed the noblest fruit of wisdom. In other particulars also Epicurus held his system to be preferable to those of ordinary physicists and of the Stoics, because of their connecting fatalism with the belief of the gods, and thus introducing the worst species of religious error, one that did not even admit the hope of averting a calamity by means of a cultus.[2]

The ethics of Epicurus were founded on the assumption of human freedom and spontaneity of will. In so completely a mechanical and materialist system of the world, where none but material causes are at work in the entire universe, he necessarily was obliged somehow or other to fasten this liberty upon a physical cause. For this reason he inculcated that baseless contingency of an infinitesimal deflection in the falling motion of atoms;[3] and with it he fancied the chain of mechanical causes to have been once at least interrupted, the will snatched from the constraint of fate, a spontaneous motion introduced into nature, which might be considered as free, because not necessarily predetermined; and then, too, the possibility might be admitted of the human will having resisted and vanquished the external impulse and stress of matter. Strange indeed was the idea of founding human liberty upon a motion of unconscious atoms, which took place without any liberty, and of making a cause produce what it is itself without.

Epicurus imagined his system emancipated man from a fourfold fear: the fear of death, of natural things, of the gods, and lastly, of destiny. Along with the fear, hope indeed and confidence were also destroyed. Meanwhile this delivery from fear is only a negative good, the removal of evil to a distance. Man must still endeavour after the highest positive good, this supreme and only

[1] Lucr. i. 930 *et passim.*

[2] Epic. *ap. Diog. L.* x. 134 (?).

[3] Lucr. ii. 251.

good being pleasure; as pain, or non-pleasure, is the one single evil. The task thus proposed to man is to fill up his life with the greatest possible amount of pleasurable and joyous sensations, and to preserve for himself, as long as he can, the blissful perception of spiritual and bodily well-being, and unclouded serenity of soul. But, as ideas are only reminiscences of earlier sensations, so the pleasure of the soul is only the recalling to mind of sensual enjoyments, combined with the hope of enjoying them again. "I should not know," said Epicurus, "how to represent to myself the idea of good, were I to suppress the enjoyment of eating and drinking, of music and beautiful forms, and the pleasures of love."[1] But it is particularly the satisfaction of the desire of nourishment, as the most corporeal and most indispensable to our nature, which affords the keenest gratification, and serves as a standard for all the rest. Metrodorus, the favourite disciple of Epicurus, used to say, "The belly is the place where centres all philosophy that is conformable to nature;"[2] and Epicurus himself styled the pleasures of the belly the root and principle of all good.[3]

Meanwhile, however, pleasure, according to this doctrine, is not itself an end, but only a means. The end is rest of soul, or ataraxy. This requires, above all things, the absence of all disturbance and all disquietude, and therefore freedom from pain; only to bring about this state, *i.e.* to quiet natural instincts, pleasure is the object of endeavour —not for its own self's sake, as the Hedonists of the Cyrenian school taught. Thus the satisfaction of the soul, consisting in the memory and hope of pleasure of the body, is that serene repose ensuing upon the removal of every bodily pain and disturbance of soul.[4] The result of this is, that wisdom and virtue consist,—after right choice and

[1] Diog. L. x. 6; Athen. vii. c. 5, xii. c. 12; Cic. *de Fin.* ii. 3.

[2] *Ap. Athen.* xii. c. 12.

[3] Athen. xii. c. 12; Cic. *N. D.* i. 40; Plut. *non posse suav. vivi sec. Epic.* 3. Ancient and modern apologists, such as Gassendi, Warnekros, and Ast (*Beleuchtung der Epik. Ethik.*, Münch. 1831), seem either to have taken no notice of these passages, or (as Ast, p. 13, does) declare them to have been partially fabrications. Had this been the case, Diogenes would not have failed to take special notice of it.

[4] Diog. L. x. 128, 131.

accurate probation made of separate kinds and states of pleasure and the unpleasant,—in the art of all always giving the preference to such one as is most fitted for attaining ataraxy, and keeping it up the longest. And so the same philosopher, who had explained the pleasures of the belly to be the true good, could also assert, "The wise man on bread and water needs not to envy Zeus his good fortune." There are cases accordingly where even bodily pain is to be chosen as the lesser evil and to avert a greater one, or where to rise in spirit above pain, for the moment inevitable, is the task of the wise man. So, too, the state or condition called virtue is only to be coveted for the pleasure's sake, and not for its own;[1] as the art of healing is only praised and used for the sake of health.

Thus the wise man of Epicurus, above all, preserves a negative and defensive attitude. With shrewd calculation, he shuns every occasion of spiritual nausea, for this is worse even than that of the body. He lives a hidden life by preference, far from affairs of state, free from the bonds and cares of family life; he shuns especially the worst of sicknesses, the passion of love, and ambition, envy, and revenge as well. He steers his spirit at a distance from the contemplation of evil, and towards the memory and hope of delight: he prefers to disquieting enjoyments painless repose, and hence he lives moderately. He bears unflinchingly bodily sufferings, with the consciousness that violent pain is not lasting, and lingering pain not violent; he avoids committing acts of injustice in order not to be disturbed in his soul's tranquillity by fear of punishment. Justice, Epicurus taught, is but a conventional idea; nothing is by nature just. Hence injustice is not an evil in itself, but it is only the fear of the bad consequences on the act being discovered that makes it into one.[2]

The further the disciples of Epicurus felt themselves removed from the rest of mankind by their mode of viewing life, the closer and more harmoniously did they shut themselves up together. Centuries after their founder's death this sect resembled a well-ordered republic, disquieted by no uproar or dissension, and governed by one spirit,[3] in

[1] Diog. L. x. 138. [2] Sen. *Ep.* 97; Diog. L. x. 150, 151.
[3] Numen. *ap. Eus. Pr. Evg.* xiv. 5.

which respect they distinguished themselves to advantage from the Stoics, who were split into many factions. With the exception of one individual, Metrodorus of Stratonice, who attached himself to Carneades, not a single Epicurean renounced his school. After the example of their master, who had written "like a priest" on the worship of the gods, the disciples hesitated not to participate in religious acts or to frequent the temples. All these acts of worship were, indeed, said they, so far profitless, as there was nothing to fear and nothing to hope from the gods; but to honour these beings on the score of their natural eminence and excellence was a sensible act, and could do no harm.[1] In several Greek cities the operation of their principles was so prejudicial to youth, that people would not tolerate them. The republic of Messenia, in Arcadia, bid them quit their territory by sunset, as they were the pest of youth, and wrought danger to the state by their effeminate customs and their atheism. After their departure the priests were obliged to purify the temple, the courts, and the entire city. A decree of equal stringency was passed by the city Lyctos, in Crete, against the Epicureans, as declared enemies of the gods, and disseminators of an effeminate and degrading philosophy. Nevertheless this school came by degrees to be the most numerous of all the sects of philosophy.

Scepticism had its origin in the same practical object as that which two such irreconcilable systems as Epicurism and Stoicism had proposed to themselves—the attainment of happiness and ataraxia. The judgment of men of this tendency was, that tranquillity of spirit, and its attendant happiness of life, were not to be found in any of the ways hitherto pursued; for the opinions and prejudices of all earlier schools led men astray, disquieted and wore them out in painful and passionate efforts without end. Pyrrho of Elis, a contemporary of Aristotle (about 325 B.C.), and his disciple Timon of Phlius, were the first to develop this theory: their school, however, soon disappeared. More influential was the scepticism which the scholars of the new Academy, Arcesilaus (318–244 B.C.) and the much-admired Carneades (215–130), opposed to the dogmatic systems of their age. And when the new Academy

[1] Cic. *N. D.* i. 41; Sen. *de Benef.* iv. 18.

attached itself to eclecticism, there appeared, as the restorer of the Pyrrhonic scepticism, Ænesidemus of Cnossus, who seems to have lived about the beginning of the Christian era.

This school maintained in general, that, along with the sensual conceptions and perceptions of man and his consciousness of the same, still no truth or certainty was communicated, and that by these ideas and perceptions man still knew nothing of real being. The partisans of this doctrine would not say outright that what they gainsayed was untrue; they thought it might very well be true, and yet man have no certainty thereupon, and be obliged to leave it undecided; or the uncertainty on one side was as great as the other. Hence Sextus, the most acute of the philosophers of this turn of mind in antiquity, defined scepsis to be a cleverness in so setting phenomena and ideas in opposition one with the other from any point of view, as, through the equipoise of mutually contradictory facts and principles, first to arrive at a reservation of one's judgment, and then at unshaken repose of mind.[1] We are, said this school, in such relation to things, that in their real constitution they are to us indistinguishable and indeterminable; therefore neither truth nor error result from our opinions, whether abstractions or conclusions from them; consequently we must remain with opinions or inclinations not made up this way or that, and without agitation, and must say of every one thing, that it no more is than is not, or that it is just as much as it is not, and therefore does not non-exist;[2] but for the requirements of practical life we must absolutely abide by the apparent. Thus man will attain a repose of mind not further disturbable by opinion.[3]

Justifiable as was this Scepticism in reference to both of the two systems, Stoic and Epicurean, whose limited and arbitrary dogmatism had provoked it, it was equally symptomatic of that universal division of intellect and uncertainty now in the ascendant, which had come in in the train of political events of the day. The life and conscience of the Greek, no longer, as before, under the strict obligations of

[1] *Hypot.* i. 8. [2] Aristocl. *ap. Eus. Præp. Evg.* xiv. 18.
[3] Sext. Emp. *Hypot.* i. 192 sqq.; Diog. Laert. ix. 105–8.

law and custom, lost more and more of this external restraint, and the propensity spread of applying a subjective criticism to existing things, which no longer satisfied spirits, nor were commensurate to new relations and exigencies, and of adopting or rejecting them according to one's private inclination or opinion. There were sceptics who would acknowledge no truth whatever, but were convicted of falsehood by their own actions. A man should, it was required, make the reservation of his assent so general, that even where no grounds of doubt whatever, present or conceivable, existed, still the truth of the matter was to be denied.[1] And what was the attitude of scepticism to religion? Sextus says: "Following the ordinary route, though without really maintaining it, we affirm that there are gods,[2] *i.e.* we say so; but we are not in earnest about it, we leave it an open question." Then he goes on: "The proofs for the existence of God which the dogmatists (meaning the Stoics) have adduced sound, in truth, very specious, and yet there are also very weighty arguments on the other side. Generally speaking, the existence of God is not demonstrable, for there are many conditions wanting to it; there are the most manifold contradictions in the very idea of God, and experience proves this, for the notions of man about the deity are so very contradictory, that the ground is cut from under the feet of the investigator in the act." [3]

They were weapons of Carneades with which Sextus was fighting here. That remarkable man, the head of the new Academy, left his school behind him in a flourishing condition, and Cicero speaks of him as a really great intellect with a special reverence, which was assuredly founded, in the main, on the intellectual affinity between them.[4] He was led by his hostility to the still growing empire of the Stoic system to perfect and secure the foundations of the Scepsis, lately received from Arcesilaus. Whilst occupying the same ground of sensualism

[1] Sext. *Hypot.* i. 34.

[2] *Hypot.* iii. 2 sqq.: ἀδοξαστώς φαμεν εἶναι θεούς· where ἀδοξαστώς is the contrary expression to τίθησί τι ὡς ὕπαρχον.

[3] *Hypot.* iii. 6–9; *Adv. Math.* ix. 137–194.

[4] *De Fin.* v. 2; *De Orat.* ii. 38.

with the Stoics, he asserted that neither observation in itself, nor human reason, furnished criteria for distinguishing between the true and the false. In particular, a new criticism was applied by him to the Stoic theology, the bearings of which extended beyond the dogmas of that school, and which in reality was intended to prove all conviction of the existence of the deity, and all religious belief whatever, impossible and untenable. Cicero nevertheless repeatedly assures us he did not do this with the intention to destroy belief in the gods, but only to expose the weakness and groundlessness of the Stoic doctrines.[1] To the appeal to the universality of belief in gods he opposed, in part, the denial of such universality; in other part, the little value to be set upon what the ignorant multitude believe. He contested the assumption of a divine order in the world, and a providence, by pointing to the general misery of man, the bad use the great proportion made of the pretended divine gift of reason, and the abundant happiness and prosperity of the evil: there was nowhere any indication to be discovered of a world-soul or a government by a deity. The idea that God was an infinite being, and at the same time a personality existing and living for himself, involved a contradiction. Were God a living being, he must be also capable of suffering, and therefore exposed to death; while, as a corporeal being, he must besides consist of parts, and therefore be divisible and destructible. Thus his principal aim was to point out contradictions resulting from any property attributed, or that might be attributed, to God.[2] The Stoics themselves had taken under the wing of their philosophy the heathen divination and oracles, with the whole system of popular belief; Carneades, on the contrary, handled his sceptical weapons with special dexterity; and Cicero, following him, has carried out the subject in an agreeable style, showing how this deification of natural powers left no discoverable token by which to discern the divine and the non-divine, and how one is obliged thereby to put up with the strangest and absurdest gods.[3]

[1] Cic. *N. D.* iii. 17.
[2] *Ibid.* iii. 12–14; Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* ix. 137–147.
[3] Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* ix. 182–190; Cic. *N. D.* iii. 17.

Scepticism had already fallen into decay along with the school of the Neo-Academicians, when Ænesidemus[1] of Cnossus, who taught in Alexandria, attempted to revive it, but only as a means towards paving the way again for the long-forgotten and defunct doctrine of Heraclitus. Accordingly, the later Sceptics did not acknowledge him for one of theirs, and Sextus refuted him in detail.[2] In his hands, in fact, scepsis was to lead to the knowledge that opposite qualities show themselves in the same things; from which resulted the Heraclitic doctrine that things contain qualities really contradictory. Ænesidemus only granted corporeal beings, and took air (hot or fiery) to be the primitive substance and basis of all things; and this was equally in the whole and in all its parts, and again was identical with time. This air, or divine fire, flows into the human soul; the thinking powers of man are nourished on it, and are not distinguishable from the faculty of observation.[3] It was, then, a materialistic pantheism that Ænesidemus attempted to support by sceptically combating other systems.

Meanwhile the greater number of earnest thinking spirits in the second and third century before Christ inclined to Stoicism. Even the Peripatetics had renounced progressively their master's non-materialism, and done homage to the opposite creed of Zeno and Cleanthes. People would hear no more of that first highest cause which is pure, perfectly incorporeal intelligence, and thinking activity. Nay more, the materialistic tendency entertained by both schools, Stoic as well as Epicurean, had made so much way, that now even the Aristotelians only admitted material existences, and would acknowledge nothing except corporeal substances, in which they only distinguished power and act. Thus the Peripatetics, Critolaus, and Diodorus of Tyre, and probably Cratippus also, whom Cicero styles the first philosopher of his time, derived the soul from the ethereal fire dispersed in and

[1] Ænesidemus seems to have been a contemporary of Cicero; for he dedicated his work to Lucius Tubero, the same who was the friend of Cicero, and subsequently proconsul in Africa.

[2] Sext. Emp. *Hypot.* i. 210–213; Cic. *N. D.* iii. 17.

[3] Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* x. 216.

about the universe.[1] Antiochus of Ascalon, a friend of Cicero, thought he could extract one philosophy from the three, Stoicism, Platonism, and Aristotelianism, wherein, of course, the Stoic doctrine was to form the basis. Cicero himself, though formed entirely on the writings of the Platonic and Peripatetic school, understood no more by the incorporeality he attributed to the soul along with its immortality, than that it was a body surpassing in subtlety all other things obnoxious to sense. The universal notion of God gradually became this, that he was an exquisitely fine and ethereal fluid, which, being lighter and subtler than air and fire, is found in the motion always belonging to its essence. Thus, behind and above matter perceptible to the sense, perpetual search was being made for another imperceptible one, the existence of which was mere hypothesis; but a matter, a fifth elemental substance, there must be, and the only effort made was to describe it as fine, thin, and inaccessible to all the instruments of sense as possible. But there were also Stoics who imagined the soul to be of such gross material that if a man happened to be shut up in a house or rock that had fallen on him, his soul would be imprisoned, and incapable of escaping; or, in case of drowning, it would be extinguished in the water.

The *Book of the World*, bearing Aristotle's name, is a remarkable memorial of a half-Peripatetic, half-Stoic view of the world. It seems to belong to a later time, extending perhaps to the birth of Christ. The author rejects the Stoic doctrine, that God is mixed with matter and penetrates the whole world with his substance. The motion of the world undoubtedly proceeds from God, who, however, unmoved and raised above all contact with the world, has his seat in the extremest limits of the ethereal region. Only the sphere of fixed stars received its motion immediately from him, through which it was first communicated to the lower earth impure and mutable. Here the Stoic principle, identifying the ether, of which the heavenly bodies consist, with fire, is rejected, and the eternity of the world, equally in contradiction with Stoic doctrine, asserted. But while he thus keeps aloof from a pantheistic blending

[1] Cic. *de Div.* i. 50: comp. i. 32, 49.

of the divine substance with the world, he distinguishes between the essence and the power of God. Yet he treats this power not as mere strength or mode of operation, but as a substance, penetrating and filling all things, which embraces and keeps together things generally, and, in fine, is not essentially different from that ethereal fluid emanating from heaven, which circulates as vital essence in all, and from which also he derives the substance of the soul. Besides the names and myths of Zeus, the mythological personifications of destiny, Nemesis, Adrasteia, and the Moirai, were interpreted upon the same divine principle, supported by Stoic etymologies.[1]

On the whole, this last period of the Greek philosophy, extending over into the Christian, bore the marks of intellectual exhaustion and impoverishment, and of despair in the solution of the high problem. The rich capital of thought, left behind by Plato and Aristotle, lay for the most part unvalued and unused. Philosophy disclaimed going beyond the circle of phenomena; and the higher class of physics, by the help of which the old philosophers had constructed their systems, was soon given up, and physics limited to medical objects principally. Seneca, it is true, asserted in his physical work, that physics were the highest division of philosophy, much higher than ethics, having to do with the divine; but he himself proceeds to reduce them in the same treatise to the explanation of meteorological and terrestrial phenomena. His own opinion was, that physics only deserved to be studied, inasmuch as the knowledge of the heavenly teaches us to despise the earthly.

The most positive of these systems, the Stoic, had still maintained the existence of a higher principle, which, however, could only exist inseparably in, and along with, matter; but since this principle was at the same time conceived to be stripped of all independence and of all capacity of a subsistence of its own, it went on gradually falling into pure abstraction and empty form, and, by a similar law of development, virtue and wisdom being no longer referred to a higher object above man, necessarily lost at last all their higher elements. If the old Stoics still

[1] *Pseudo-Aristot. de Mundo.*

made order and beauty, as the divine reflex in nature, to be the end and rule of human will; with the later Stoics, Epictetus, for instance, this will has no other object, no end, and no rule, other than itself; reason is reduced to ability to make use of our perceptions, *i.e.* is identical with the will; and this will, deprived of every higher *point d'appui*, is only being always directed to concentrate itself within itself as much as possible, to seek and to find all in itself alone.[1] The whole is resolved more and more into negations and abstractions, and the same emptiness and poverty extends to all departments of philosophy. Sensualism dominates in the doctrine of knowledge. As there is no other source of knowledge than sense, nothing can be known otherwise than through phenomena. Morals are occupied only with the direction of the instincts, with the physically useful, and with egoistical glorification. This, for example, in the case of Marcus Aurelius, goes the length of formal adoration of his own "I"; that same "I" for which there was nothing to prognosticate, but that it should return into the elements out of which it came, and in death should be changed into something else, just whatever the universe needed.[2] Thus, then, the lot of the god in human form, of the wise man who, after the dictum of Chrysippus, was not to fall short of Zeus in virtue and excellence, who possessed everything in a will regardless of all but himself, was at the last but this,—to be overwhelmed in the common destiny, and to disappear in the abyss of the great unsparing process of metamorphosis and dissolution.

On the other hand, the theory of probability, adopted by Carneades, and the eclecticism of the later Academy, involved the admission that philosophy, left to herself, must renounce the solution of the highest problems, and the human intellect either put in a general disclaimer to knowledge and certainty, or look for help and light from other sources. Suppose all the criteria of general objective truth rejected, still subjective probability remained; which means, that man would be advised to content himself with a higher or lesser degree of probability, in proportion as the question were more or less important in practice. One must renounce knowledge, thought Carneades; but pre-

[1] Cf. Epict. *Diss.* ii. 11. 16, iii. 3.

[2] *Ibid.* iii. 23. 13.

sumptions and probabilities, as rules of conduct for life, were not to be given up, even though they have no certainty to our minds.[1]

Eclecticism at this time was grounded on the view that each man, without and before any serious intellectual education, possessed already in his intellectual tact and feeling a criterion of truth, by the aid of which he could choose out of all philosophical systems the best, *i.e.* the one most easily adapted for himself, and thereon form a whole for himself. This tendency, specially inculcated by the doctors of the later Academy, Philo of Larissa and others, presupposed that truth was not to be found in any of the foregone systems, though each one contained at least some few notions of truth of its own, and the individual was to combine together heterogeneous fragments torn out of an organic whole according to his own caprice, in fact, as this or that doctrine suited him best. Here was, in fact, a declaration of doubt and despair in philosophy as a science.

[1] Cic. *Acad.* ii. 31, 32; Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* vii. 166 sqq.

BOOK VI

THE RELIGIONS IN ANTERIOR AND CENTRAL ASIA AND IN AFRICA

I. Asia Minor

If the Greeks gladly lavished the rich stores of their intellectual life even upon their gods, individualised them more and more, and humanised and severed them from nature, so creating a numerous circle of divine forms for themselves, the gods of the Orientals, on the other hand, continued on the low level of mere powers of nature, and even when endowed with personality, were still always widely separated from man. For this reason the Asiatic family of gods remained limited to a few who were worshipped with an unconditional devotion, a mixture of fear and sensuality; but, as their only manifestations were in colourless and hazy outline, they never reached the plastic precision of Hellenic gods, except in so far as they were astral deities.

In Asia Minor the elastic nature of the Hellenic deities made it easy for the Greeks, in every point of view, to blend the old indigenous gods, or such as had immigrated from the south-east, with their own; whereby the Asiatic character of rite came to be preserved, and was even readily adopted by the Greek population. Only where, as in the case of Men-Lunus, the sex of the deity resisted hellenisation, were the Greeks compelled to leave the god as they found him. Yet it was natural, in such contact and fusion

of the humanised Greek deity with the Asiatic god of purely natural complexion, the physical side should prevail, and the Græco-mythic and personal element retire into the shade. Generally, wherever in Asia a male god was reckoned a first-class one, the Greeks immediately stamped him as Zeus, without troubling themselves about his real character. Thus Zeus became, on Asiatic soil, a kind of generic name, a designation under which people everywhere recognised the highest god of the country.

This contingency is most strikingly instanced in Caria, where the Zeus Labrandeus of that country, so called because his temple stood in the Carian town of Labranda, was elsewhere also styled Men. He was represented, in Asiatic fashion, as an hermaphrodite with beard and woman's breasts, and swathed like the Ephesian Artemis;[1] so that everything about him was foreign to the Hellenic Zeus. One of his attributes was the double axe, the peculiar symbol of the hermaphrodite. It seemed to the Greeks, however, an indication of a war-god; accordingly Herodotus speaks of the Carians as being the only people who worshipped Zeus as a war-god. In the Carian town Mylasa there was yet another Zeus honoured besides him, a Zeus Osogo with the trident, and more resembling Poseidon. In the extremely ancient temple of this deity, Carians, Lydians, and Mysians offered a sacrifice in common; a custom, according to Herodotus, founded on an affinity of race between these people.[2] As we read in the account of the same historian of Carians in Egypt cutting themselves with knives on certain festivals, and even slashing their faces,[3] they probably had, in their own home-settlement, the same rites of the great Mother-goddess and her favourite as the rest, for they were everywhere celebrated with uniformity; in fact, the pyramidal-shaped stones of the great Mother are found on the coins of Carian cities.

The religious system of Phrygia is only exhibited to us under the form in which it was already combined with the nature worship of the Syro-Phœnician races settled

[1] Lenormant, *Galérie Mythol.* p. 53.
[2] Her. i. 171, v. 119. [3] *Ibid.* ii. 61.

there. The leading worship of the Phrygian religion is that of the great Mother, a rite spread generally over Asia Minor, and in Mysia and Galatia particularly. This goddess, styled Mother, though she never was so, had neither son nor daughter, and appears in the Attis myths as the enemy of all procreation. Hence the sagas afterwards attempted to explain the name of Mother which she bore by her having nursed all her brothers, or as having been a maiden excessively attached to little children. Agdistis was in principle only an androgynous form of Cybele, a fact coarsely and indecently expressed in the myth. Like the different figures of the Asiatic nature-goddess, Cybele was also neither a deity of earth nor moon exclusively, though attributes of both were mingled in the representation of her person. The various sagas of Attis, minister and minion of the goddess, all agreeing in the youth's having castrated himself in a fit of madness which she had thrown him into, seem rather to have originated in the custom already prevalent of a sacrifice of self-mutilation to Cybele, and to have put forward such rite in a mythical personage, than the act to have served as a type for the custom, and the myth to have first elicited it, as in the ordinary acceptation. In the festivals of the goddess and her favourite, as in the myth, there is no observable variation of ideas from those forming the basis of the relation between Adonis and the Asiatic nature-goddess. But if the mutilation of Attis signifies no more than the decay of natural life in winter,[1] this incongruity results,—that winter is followed by no spring, death by no renovation and reanimation. Attis is, and remains, mutilated, and he and his patroness smitten with barrenness. The castration of the Galli must have involved another principle beyond the mere picturesque analogy to the dying of natural productions in winter.

On the first day of the double solemnity, a pine, or fir-tree in fruit, was cut down and carried into the temple of the goddess, with an image of Attis suspended. On the second day, lamentation was made for the lost Attis, to the melancholy clang of the Phrygian horn; a lamentation which the third day dissolved into jubilant and unbridled

[1] As Creuzer thinks, *Symbolik*, ii. 367, 3rd edit.

delight at the recovery of Attis, followed by a solemn washing of the Mother, or the stone which represented her, in the stream Almo. On occasion of this feast the priests and servants of the goddess executed their orgiastic dance, and the Phrygian flutes, with the intonations peculiar to this people, were specially calculated to throw the mind into a state of wild enthusiastic excitement. They ran about with blazing torches and terrific howling, and cut and stabbed themselves on their feet and arms, as the priests of Baal—those in Samaria, for example[1]—used to do. The frenzy mounted to such a pitch, that at last these men, carried away by an irresistible impulse to ingratiate themselves with the goddess and her favourite by making his state their own, tore the clothes from their bodies and mutilated themselves with a shell or sharp stone, upon which, instead of the phallus, the maimed and bloody member was immediately carried round in procession. These priestly eunuchs were called "Galli," a Bithynian word signifying those so mutilated. The tumult of mind into which they were thrown by the nature of the ceremonial rendered them insensible to the pain of the operation. They now laid aside all signs of manhood, and aimed at appearing like women in dress and manner. This strange conduct and rite of the Galli must have spread far beyond Phrygia; for when the Romans were preparing to besiege the city of Sestos on the Hellespont, a host of these priestly eunuchs were sent to meet them.[2] The Metragyrtæ were participators in this worship, and traversed all the neighbouring countries, and Greece particularly, to the sound of the drum and Phrygian flute, with the image of the goddess, wounding themselves and asking alms.

The same character of a wild rite of nature belonged to the cultus of the Phrygian patron-god, Sabazios, who, being closely connected with Attis and Adonis, or rather, being only another form of Attis, was a mythic personage of such indistinctness as to be sometimes regarded as Zeus, sometimes as Dionysos or his son. His worship was celebrated in a similar manner, with discordant howling, with the hoarse music of cymbal and kettle-drum, and a

[1] 1 Kings xviii. 28. [2] Liv. xxxvii. 9.

particular dance, the Sicynnis. The god's name seems to have been derived from that of the priests (clatterers, howlers).

The worship of the great Mother was dominant also in Bithynia and Lydia. Of Lydia, Hermesianax had sung that Attis, son of the Phrygian Calaos, a eunuch born, here propagated the mysteries of the Phrygian goddess, and stood so high in her favour that Zeus, from jealousy, had him killed by a wild boar.[1] But the Bithynians on their mountains invoked a god under the name of "Papa," and Attis, in whom the Greeks thought to recognise their Zeus.[2] In Lycia, indeed, the principal god was Apollo, an arrival from Crete: his favourite situation was Patara, but the stone of Cybele is also found upon the coins; for stones, as well aërolites as others, nay rocks and whole mountains, were symbols of this nature-goddess: and according to the myth in *Timotheus*, Cybele was born of a stone animated by the breath of deity. Cybele also is discovered at Iconium, the capital of Lycaonia, combined with Demeter and the Ephesian Artemis. The rite of that place is a remarkable proof to what strange combinations of gods the Græco-Asiatic theocrasy led. A Demeter Achaia (or the sorrowful), with ten breasts, and therefore corresponding to the nature-goddess of Ephesus, was honoured here; and, along with her and Dionysos, a quadruple "Cora," in whom, therefore, Persephone, Hecate, Artemis, and probably Anaitis, had been concentrated.[3]

In Cappadocia and Pontus the population, a mixture of Armenian and Syrian races, served a goddess "Ma" as the presiding deity of the country. The Greeks took her for an Artemis, or the war-goddess Enyo, the Romans for Bellona: she was nevertheless a nature-goddess of more general signification, like Anaitis or Mylitta. Her temple at Comana on the Iris was the oldest, holiest, and richest of the land; the arch-priest ranked next to the king, and was generally chosen from the royal family, and had under him, up to the time of Augustus, six thousand male and female hierodouloi, the latter of whom prostituted themselves; so that Strabo calls the town a small Corinth, on account of

[1] Paus. vii. 17. [2] Arrian, *ap.* Eustath. in the *Fragm. Hist. Græc.* iii. 592.
[3] Τετρακόρη, Boeckh. *Corp. Inscr.* n. 4000.

the number of courtesans there consecrated to the goddess.[1] The influence of this deity and her worship is evidenced in the character of the numerous population of Comana, which was effeminate, and the greater proportion were visionaries and fanatics. Twice a year here "the march of the goddess" was celebrated by solemn processions, and on these occasions the high-priest wore the ensigns of royalty. They were marked with the ordinary features of Asiatic religions, a union of a rite of blood and laceration with swords with sensual debauchery. On the Sarus lay a town of the same name, having the same cultus of Anaitis, with a powerful high-priest, and a no less numerous sacred ministry. In addition to these, there was a third and fourth chief temple of the land: one of Zeus at Venasa, where there were three thousand hierodouloi, and that at Cabira of Men-Pharnac, a lunar god, connected with the sun, or borrowing his light from that planet, by whom the sovereigns of Pontus swore their most cherished oath. The worship of this god, Lunus, was spread over the whole of Asia Anterior, also in Syria and Albania; but wherever the moon was honoured as a male, the sun was necessarily invoked as goddess; or a solar signification must have been superadded to the comprehensive one of a nature-goddess. It is possible, however, the metamorphosis of the sun into a female deity—a change to which the fact of there being a people ruled over by a queen gave occasion—contributed to the idea of the moon as a male deity. On the other hand, a notion was prevalent at Carrhæ in Mesopotamia, that whoever imagines the moon to be a female, and honours her as goddess, is a slave to women; all, on the contrary, who viewed him as a male, would maintain their authority over their wives.

The Persian fire-worship had also found an entrance into Cappadocia as well as into Lydia. "There are here," says Strabo, "fire-sanctuaries, enclosed spaces; in the middle, an altar with a great deal of ashes, in which the magicians keep up a perpetual fire. Every day they go in and sing for nearly an hour, keeping the bundle of rods or 'barsam' before the fire, with the tiara on their heads, hanging down on both sides and covering the lips." The

[1] Strabo, pp. 558, 559.

city of Zela in Pontus was a special seat of this Persian worship, where, at the same time, was a famous temple of Anaitis and other Persian deities, with numerous priests and temple-servants.[1]

In the Lydians, whose ancestor "Lud" is enumerated in the Mosaic table of nations as a son of Sem, and who therefore belong to the Semitic family, one recognises the reciprocal influence exercised by religion on a people's customs and character, and *vice versâ*. In their earlier period they were a valiant and martial people, whose cavalry were reckoned the best of that time;[2] but later there was hardly a people in such disesteem as the Lydians for their unmanly softness and luxurious mode of life. Cyrus had hardly anything to do with this conversion, because he forbade them the use of weapons, and put them into long clothes, and had them taught to dance and sing.[3] These are not means which change the character of a nation into its opposite; the deities, whose rites the Lydians were gradually introducing, really had far the largest share in the matter. Under the influence of an Assyrian dynasty, which ruled here between the thirteenth and seventh centuries B.C., the cultus of Asiatic nature deities was the predominant one, as is shown in the capital, Sardes.[4] There were honoured the Ephesian Artemis, the Hera of Samos, probably of kin to the Babylonian or Assyrian Juno (Mylitta), the goddess of Paphos, with temple built exactly after the pattern of the Cyprian one, and the same rite, and the Persian Anaitis, whose temple had been built by order of Artaxerxes. Cybele, under the name of Ma, was goddess of the land of Lydia as well as Phrygia; and the Greeks were acquainted with her principally as the goddess of Sardes, "The blessed one, seated upon the bull-destroying lion, the mountain mother and all-nursing earth."[5] We must add, besides, the Lydian Heracles, or the sun-god Sandon, as he was styled here, as well as in Cilicia and Assyria, and whom the Greeks held to be their Heracles. It was the sun, as alternating between the winter decay

[1] Amm. Marcell. xxiii. c. 3, s. 2; Spartian. *Carac.* 8; Herodian. iv. 13.
[2] Herod. i. 79. [3] *Ibid.* i. 155.
[4] Raoul-Rochette, *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscr.* xvii. 209.
[5] Soph. *Philoctet.* 390–403.

and the mighty awakening and generative power of spring, which was invested with the form now of the weak and powerless, or soft womanly god, and again with that of a god of manlike strength and energy, an idea expressed, as so commonly in Asia, by a woman's dress or by the androgynous form of image. The half-warlike, half-womanly Omphale, whom Heracles had to serve as husband or slave in woman's apparel at the spinning-wheel, was the Asiatic nature-goddess, or a form of Cybele, who bore the name of the pyramidal stone image (Omphalos); the son of these two was reckoned the progenitor of the Lydian ruling race, the Heracleids. The signification was the same when in the island of Cos, originally peopled from Phœnicia, the priest of Heracles had to sacrifice in woman's clothes.[1] Another symbolical custom attaching to this Heracles-Sandon was the burning of the image. The god of time and the sun, who died in the winter solstice, awoke from his funeral pile to a new life. Such a pile there was erected every five years at Tarsus in Cilicia, and most splendidly ornamented, where this Assyro-Phœnician Heracles and sun-god was honoured as founder and archegetes.[2]

The several rites of these Lydian deities correspond with the myths. The daughters of the Lydians practised unchastity as a service to the gods, and not merely prostituted themselves to strangers, but in old times were obliged at the command of Omphale, *i.e.* in the service of that goddess, to surrender their persons even to slaves.[3] This custom of religious prostitution in an entire people was at a later period so hardly intelligible to the Greeks, that they fancied it must have been introduced some time or other by compulsion, as a memorial of an old crime committed on women, and as a revenge for the same; and they told how Omphale, the old queen of the country, while ill-treated herself as a slave in that manner, had imposed upon all fathers to devote their daughters to this service of unchastity.

[1] Plut. *Quæst. Gr.* 58.

[2] Raoul-Rochette's idea (*Mém.* xvii. 32–35) is not improbable, that the Pamphylian hero Er, who came to life again after lying twelve days in the funeral pile, was identical with the Assyro-Phœnician sun-god. His name might be the Semitic Ur (light or fire).

[3] Clearch. Sol. in the *Fragm. Hist. Gr.* ii. 305.

II. Persia and the other Irânian Countries

That branch of the Arian family of nations which was domiciled to the east of the Tigris as far as the Indus and in the mountains lying to the north, inhabited the Irânian highland of Bactria, Media, and Persia. Subsequently they formed a great empire of Central and Western Asia, and subjugated the Chamites and Semites dwelling on their western flank. Zoroaster was honoured as the heaven-sent founder of their religion. The age in which he lived—and he was not the founder, but rather the reformer of his people's religion—it is impossible now to fix precisely. He may have been somewhat junior to Moses (perhaps about 1300 B.C.): in any case he did not live, as has been frequently asserted by mistake, under the father of Darius Hystaspes (about 550 B.C.). He was probably a Bactrian,[1] at a period when a great and independent empire existed there. In the same country also appeared the religious books of the *Zendavesta* bearing his name. These writings, embracing a space of many centuries, and originally composed in the Bactrian language, are manifestly not the work of one man, and a very small proportion could have been Zoroaster's; but he is lauded in them as being the only one "who had received the traditions of the supreme God, and was enabled to communicate them." Besides, according to the later sagas, the whole of the religious literature of Persia must have been annihilated in the stormy times of the Macedonian conquest; so that the most of what is now forthcoming must have been supplied from memory at a later age under the Parthian sovereignty. This pretended destruction is, however, contradicted by distinct facts and by notices of the Greeks, to the effect that the Zend writings were in use in the times of the Seleucidæ and Parthians. Modern investigations about the text have resulted in a favourable account of the relative genuineness and the high antiquity of these writings; there is no doubt the greater part of the books of Zoroaster, of which there should have been twenty-one, are lost; and that what still survives was first collected and arranged in the national revival under the

[1] Amm. Marc. (xxiii. c. 6, s. 32) already styles him so.

Sassanidæ. Then, and in part still later, the most copious work of the present collection, the *Bundehesch*, with its cosmogonical contents, was first taken down in writing.

Zoroaster (Zarathustra) appears already in the Zend books as a mythical prophet, invested with the halo of the marvellous. He also received, by degrees, honours almost divine. He was looked upon as the mediator between the good god, Ormuzd, and men; and later as the ruler of this earthly globe. But no other of the old religions (that of the Old Testament of course being out of the question) has so distinctly stamped upon itself and enunciated the idea of a divine doctrinal revelation as the Persian. Zoroaster is here the prophet inspired of God, by whose mouth Ormuzd has spoken, and who has promulgated a law to be faithfully accepted by every one.

But supposing the accounts of the Greeks, earlier and later, of a Zoroaster or Zaratus, relate to the Zarathustra of the Zend writings, the result would be endless contradiction, and no connected history of any kind. The perplexity is so great here that an old scholar was of opinion there was no way out of it but by the assumption of six different Zoroasters; he distinguished a Chaldean or Assyrian, a Bactrian, a Medo-Persian, a Pamphylian, and a Babylonian, with one of Proconnesos.[1] Following in his wake, the generality have agreed in the necessity of adopting two at least.

The Greeks, in fact, speak to Zoroastric writings which have clearly nothing in common with the Zend ones; and they assign a personality to the name of Zoroaster as different from that of the Zarathustra of history as the Magians were distinct from the Athravas of the Zend books. Their Zoroaster was, at bottom, a representative of a form of religion, the type of a worship and a priestly caste in connection with it, and was domiciled in Western or Central Asia, in one or other of those countries which, in primitive times, formed a contingent of a great Chamite-Cephenic kingdom. From all appearances, the real name of this mythical personage was Zaratas or Zarades; and when the Greeks, later on, came to hear of the Zarathustra of

[1] Stanleii *Hist. Philos.* xiii. 1, 2, p. 1112.

Eastern Asia, he was thrown in along with him. So, if Pythagoras drew his doctrines from Chaldean sources, the Chaldean or Assyrian Zaratas, it was supposed, must have been his master.[1] He might even possibly be identical with Cham or Nimrod, as a type of Chamite heathenism, or be taken to be a son of Cham,[2] and be placed in the period of the building of the tower of Babel, or six thousand years before Plato's death, or five thousand years before the fall of Troy; and, accordingly as he was taken for Chaldean or Armenian, Assyrian or Mede, he might again be identified with the Egyptian Misraim, who lived at a later day towards the east, and colonised Bactria.[3] "From these spring-heads," it was said in an untitled fragment, "godlessness welled over the world; for Misraim was the inventor of magic and astrology, and the same person the Greeks call Zoroaster."[4] Again, Zoroaster, or Zaratas, is also spoken of as a Bactrian king, who, with the aid of magic arts and the arcana of the Chaldeans, had a contest with the Assyrian Ninus, but was worsted in spite of his magic; or he is a governor of Media and Assyria who rebelled against Semiramis. Of these accounts a religious struggle of Magianism with the worship of Bel and the Syrian Dove goddess—for such Semiramis was[5]—seem to have been the foundation. The magical Fire-rite, the origin of which was assigned by old tradition of the country to the Median province of Azerbidschan, was laid on him by the saga, to the purport that he abode on a mountain, which was suddenly enveloped in flames by fire from heaven. Out of this Zoroaster issued unhurt, and instructed the king and the Persians, who had witnessed the miracle, to invoke the god there visible.[6] Hence, in Euhemeristic style, the god

[1] Hippolyt. *Philosoph.* p. 8, ed. Oxon.; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 304 B. Huet has already observed that the name Nazaratus here is a clerical error for Zaratus.

[2] Movers, *die Phönic.* i. 350 sqq.

[3] Plin. *H. N.* xxx. 2; Clem. *Recog.* iv. 27; Clem. *Homil.* ix. 4, p. 214, Schwegler; Arnob. i. 52, p. 36, Oehler.

[4] Rawlinson, *Journ. of the R. Asiat. Soc.* xv. 238.

[5] Cephalion, *Fragmenta Hist. Gr.*, ed. Müller, iii. 626, 627. Compare Blum on the early diffusion of Syrian influence and worship in Central Asia (*Herodot und Ktesias*, pp. 260 sqq.). He observes that the cultus of Semiramis was in its full splendour at the court of Ninus.

[6] Dio Chrysost.

Zervan, whose worship belonged to the Cushite or Scythian form of religion, was confused by Berosus with Zoroaster; and Zervan again, as a Bactrian king, was designated as the (divine) progenitor of the Medes, and father of the gods.[1]

The Zaratus, the mythical form representing both magianism and its fire-rite, whom the Greeks and Western Asiatics were acquainted with, was first turned into Zoroaster when the Persian religion expanded in a westerly direction along with the Persian domination, and Zarathustra, the prophet of that religion, became known to the Greeks and Western Asiatics. As in this religion the Cushite (or Cephenic) system of gods and pyrolatry were blended with the old Arian creed, and as the Arian Athravas passed into Cushite magians, long domesticated in Babylon as well as in Media, so now Zaratus and Zarathustra, the mythical head of magianism and the Arian Bactrian prophet, were fused together. Everything accordingly points to this consequence, that Media or Bactria was the arena on which this blending of two forms of religion, very different in themselves, took place, *i.e.* of the Cushite or Scythian magianism spreading from the west, and the Arian dualism making its way from the east; a fusion out of which the Persian form of religion arose, as exhibited after the time of Darius Hystaspes. The name "Magian" is not Arian or Persian; and Roth has already observed, "on the western borders of Irân, in Media or Persia, a mixture of the religion of Ormuzd with a strange form of belief must have taken place, upon the track of which the Magians came in."[2]

Nevertheless this fusion was not effected without great struggles, in which, at one time the one element, and at another the other, had the upper hand. Hence the

[1] Moses Choren. in *Fragm. Hist. Gr.* ii. 502. Moses, referring to Berosus, holds the god Zervan to be identical with Cham. Berosus, in fact, after mention of the flood and of the Babylonian Xisuthros, speaks of three leaders, Zerovanes, Titan, and Japethostes, who are the Sem, Cham, and Japhet of Moses. Rawlinson (*l.c.* p. 245) is now of opinion that Zervan is the Ziru-Banit of the cuneiform inscriptions (this being the ordinary epithet of Bel), and the prototype of the Semitic race; so that the Zoroastric Scythians or Chamites, who imparted to the Chaldeans their Magism and their astronomy, received from these latter the worship of Zervan or Bel.

[2] In Pauly's *Real-Encyclopædie*, vi. 2893.

remarkable phenomenon that in the Scythian text of the inscription of Behistun, which immortalised the exploits of Darius, Ormuzd was designated as the god of the Arians. Therefore the god Zervan was originally a stranger to the Arians, and was only at a later period connected in the theogony with Ormuzd and Ahriman. The Ormuzd religion, having no strongly organised and exclusive priesthood, was unable to protect itself from such influence in countries where the Magians were already in existence as a very influential priesthood (originally Cushite). The Magians, impelled by natural instinct to secure themselves from falling into the condition of a hostile and oppressed sect, joined the Zend doctrine of Ormuzd, Ahriman, Mithras, Homa, and Anahita, with their own worship of elements, a junction facilitated by fire-worship, which was an ingredient of both; and the Athravas were absorbed in them by reason of their stronger organisation. The account of the well-informed Agathias, to the effect that Zoroaster, the teacher of the Magians, changed the earlier worship, and interpolated a variety of matters of belief,[1] is quite correct so far as it represents Zoroaster to be a mythical personification of the Magian caste. Some indications there are of the old Achæmenian kings of Persia having resisted and endeavoured to put the Persians proper on their guard against the irruption of Magianism. The usurpation of the Magian Gumata, in the time of Cambyses, has a religious character besides its political one: the Magians transferred the seat of power into Media, where they had the mass of the population on their side, and became more strongly organised as a priestly caste. Many of their class perished in the massacre which befell them in Persia; and for a long time after the anniversary of this Magophonia, and the crowning catastrophe of the Magian domination, was celebrated as a national festival in Persia, during which no Magian durst show himself in the streets. But Darius says, in the inscription of Behistun, "By the grace of Ormuzd I became king; I bade that what Gumata the Magian honoured should not be honoured: I have restored the temples and worship of the patron of the kingdom,

[1] Agath. ii. 24.

and of the gods, which Gumata had despoiled them of. Thus, by the favour of Ormuzd, I have gained what was carried off."

If the picture of the Persian religion in the earlier Greek accounts, namely, in Herodotus, and even in Strabo, departs so widely from the type which the *Zendavesta* represents, there is no great difficulty in explaining how it happened. The two had neither of them been in Persia proper, the language of which they were also unacquainted with; therefore they saw the Persian religious system as practised only in the countries lying more to the west, where the worship of the elements still prevailed in its earlier form, and the specific Arian worship was kept out of sight, or did not exist there at all. Just what would strike a Greek most in the Persian religion, because there was nothing like it in the Hellenic,—the antagonism between Ormuzd and Ahriman,—was not mentioned by them. Homa, too, was unknown to them. When Herodotus says the Persians called the whole circumference of the heavens Zeus, he appears to have alluded to Zervan.[1] Aristotle was the first to know anything of Ahriman; and amongst the Platonists, Alcibiades was the first to speak of Ormuzd by name, and that too in connection with Zoroaster.

If now we consider the religion of the Irânians as it is presented in the *Zendavesta*, it is palpable at first sight that the Persian religion was polytheistic, yet with a strong and prevailing monotheistic bias, whether it were that here the original monotheism was unable to check the growth of the polytheistic element, or that the old polytheism of deified nature-powers had been moderated by the monotheistic cultus of Ormuzd, which was then becoming gradually stronger, and being specially fostered and brought into prominence by Zoroaster. There are many traces pointing to a religious contest carried on by the old Irânians and their wise men, the "fire-lighters," against their ancient kinsmen by descent, the Arian Indians and their humanised nature-gods. The Indian word Deva (God) was with them a designation of the evil spirits;

[1] Bähr also thinks that Ormuzd is not alluded to in this passage; *not. ad* Herod. p. 271, ed. ii.

and it is said by Zoroaster that the Darvas, who formerly went about in the shape of men (gods in human form), would be forced by the true prayer propounded by him to hide themselves beneath the earth.

Rightly understood, the Persian doctrine knows but of one true perfect God, under a personal conception; and he only appears in the Zend writings with all the properties and prerogatives of deity. His name Ormuzd (Ahura-Mazda) signifies "the eternally wise": he is the all-wise and all-powerful creator and sovereign of the world. "No one," he cries, "could have created this world if I had not created it."[1] He generates all life and all good, and hence is the author of a good intention: purity and truth come of him. The Zoroastric doctrine, indeed, styles itself the Ormuzd religion, giving it to be understood thereby that the one Creator and God is its fundamental idea and centre, in which all the rest is included. And yet it has been lately asserted that the common ground of the Irânian and Indian creeds was in reality the fear of ghosts. The struggle between the good spirits and these malicious ones had developed among the Irânians, from the physical circumstances of their domicile, into a predominating religious system, to which Zoroaster had in essentials added nothing, but "taken the good and evil spirits together, and given them Ormuzd and Ahriman for heads."[2] On this view the Persian doctrine becomes an insoluble enigma and desperate chaos; and in particular it is incomprehensible how Zoroaster and his school could have arrived at a conception of God and the Creator so metaphysical and so nearly allied to the Old-Testament idea of Jehovah.

The Persian religious teaching is also distinguished above all the other heathen sagas and doctrines in this respect, that in it the idea of creation is prominent. Ormuzd produces the world, not by emanation, not by self-development, but by the creative word "honover," in which thought and act are coincident. Thus, in the oldest primeval records, the "Creator Ahuramazda" is extolled as "the powerful in act and full of penetration."[3] It is true this doctrine of creation, otherwise unique in

[1] *Vend. Farg.* i. [2] Dunker's *Geschichte des Alterthums*, ii. 319–323.
[3] Burnouf, *Comm. on the Yaçna*, p. 146.

heathendom, suffers a twofold limitation, inasmuch as, first, there is always a matter, or a particular world, assumed previous to creation, and the most universal elements of nature are already co-existent with Ormuzd; and next, in the share in the creation which is attributed to Ahriman.

Over against the author of all that is good and pure there stands a hostile being, an evil spirit called Druckhs (Lie), or "Bend-vo" (Tormentor), or later "Angro-Mainjus" (Ahriman), that is, "pernicious spirit." Falsehood is his essence, darkness and death his jurisdiction; by lies he makes men fools, by doubt he leads them into error and uncertainty about the truth: from falsehood and doubt all the evil acts of men have their rise. But he is not to be conceived as only the sovereign of a kingdom of darkness and evil, special, existing for itself; but his malice is universally attempting the confusion of the good and the pure, and to get the mastery of these. All "evil creatures," poisonous serpents, beasts of prey, crawling things, and vermin, are the work of Ahriman. He has therefore his share in creative power; he is not a being become bad only by free-will, but was from the beginning essentially evil. But is he from eternity? The Parsi doctrine knows of no abstract and absolute dualism: nay, according to one passage, "the good as well as the evil spirit was created by Ormuzd"; and Ahriman is always placed far below Ormuzd; whilst omniscience belongs to the latter, Ahriman has only an after-knowledge, meaning that he sees not the effects of his acts beforehand, he knows only at and with the moment of action. In order to discover his concealed wickedness to the full, Ormuzd, in the *Bundehesch*, makes this proposal. "Ahriman shall give his creatures aid, and offer hymns to me; and thus he and they shall become unassailable by hunger or death." The other answers insolently, "I will have partnership with thee in nothing: thy creatures will I sacrifice to death for eternity; in all created things I will set my friendship against thy enmity." Notwithstanding this declaration of war for all time, yet is this enmity to have an end, just as the time was when it did not exist. "There was a time when he was not; the time will come

when he shall cease to be in the creatures of Ormuzd, and at the last he shall disappear.[1]

That Zervan Akarana, the uncreated time, was the one primal being by whom Ormuzd and Ahriman were first produced, is confessedly a notion fathered upon the Zend writings from a grammatical mistake of Anquetil.[2] There is, however, mention in these writings of an element, not created by Ormuzd, but on the contrary self-existent. Zoroaster, at the bidding of Ormuzd, praises the self-established firmament, the Zervan Akarana, the endless time, and the primeval breath or air at work in high places. At the same time also, sun, moon, and stars were designated as lights, without beginning and uncreate. There was therefore, according to the older Parsi notion, a whole world, not created by Ormuzd, but eternally existing independent of him, a heaven filled with heavenly bodies, to which a second was afterwards added, the world created by Ormuzd for spirits and men, called the earth. The beings of the first world were, after Ormuzd and the other powers, objects of worship and invocation. In the natural progress of doctrine, this dualism of two worlds was softened down in this way, that, instead of uncreated heavenly bodies, only a primal light without beginning, "giving light on high," was placed, which, as was said in the *Bundehesch*, is the seat and locality of Ormuzd;[3] but light, firmament, air, and time, were contemplated as one single primal being, Zervan, to which Ormuzd stands in the relation of the revealed to the hidden God. These, however, are later ideas; in the old and genuine portions of the *Zendavesta*, Zervan is nowhere set above Ormuzd, and it may be asserted with overpowering probability that Zervan does not figure originally in the old Irânian doctrine, and that he made

[1] So the Pehlvi MS. of a Parsi manual of doctrine inspected by Jos. Müller in the *Munich Gel. Anzeigen*, xx. 541.

[2] This is the unanimous opinion of Jos. Müller, Spiegel, Roth, Brockhaus, and Haug.

[3] See the passage in Jos. Müller, in the *Abhandlungen der philos.-philol. Klasse der Münchener Akad.* 1840, p. 617. Burnouf, *Comment. sur le Yaçna*, p. 554, maintains that this primal light is not once mentioned in the existing Zend books, and that rather the sun, moon, and stars are indicated as the lights without beginning and uncreate. Accordingly he translates (*Yaçna*, c. i. 37, p. 559), "I invoke . . . the stars, the moon, the sun, luminaries without beginning, uncreate."

his way by means of the Magians into the Parsi religion as the Assyro-Chaldean principal god, the Ziru-Banit of the cuneiform inscriptions, the Belitan, or "old" Bel; and the necessity arose afterwards of connecting him with Ormuzd. A peculiar school of Zervanians, who honoured Zervan as supreme god to the degradation of Ormuzd, appears to have long kept its ground. Schahrastani mentions them next to the Zoroastric or genuine Parsi Magians, and the Thanawiehs or Dualists (Maguseans).

It was only at a later period that this doctrine concerning Zervan passed from the Magian schools into the religious belief of the people, and now received a mythotheogonic form, from which the old dualism appears to have been entirely eradicated. According to this, Zervan is the one eternal god, who for a thousand years longed and strove in sacrifice to obtain a son, Ormuzd, to bring to light heaven and earth for him. After the thousand years had elapsed, a doubt arose in his mind, Shall I indeed have a son? and therewith he begot together Ormuzd and Ahriman, the former the offspring of sacrificing trust, the latter of the doubt. Zervan now vowed to make the one who should first present himself before him supreme. This Ahriman learnt from his brother, and in order to anticipate him, pierced through the maternal womb, and appeared before Zervan, who found him dark and foul, and wished to show him the way back again. But Ahriman reminded him of his vow, whereupon Zervan gave him the supremacy for nine thousand years, at the expiration of which it should end; but to Ormuzd he gave it for ever, and said to him, "Hitherto I have sacrificed for thee; henceforward thou must sacrifice for me."[1]

[1] *Réfutation des Sectes, par* Eznig; *trad. par* Le Vaillant de Florival, Paris, 1853, pp. 75–115. Eznig the Armenian lived in the fifth century A.D. How popular and general at that time this myth was may also be gathered from the proclamation of the Persian grand-vizier Mihrnerseh (in Elisæus, *History of Vartan*, transl. by Neumann, p. 9), and from the circumstance that Theodore of Mopsuestia has devoted the whole first book of his work περὶ τῆς ἐν Περσίδι μαγικῆς to the setting forth of this doctrine of Zervan and his sons (Photius, *Biblioth. cod.* lxxxi. p. 63, Bekker). Even Theodore says of Zervan, whom he calls ἀρχηγὸν πάντων, ὅτι σπένδων ἵνα τέκῃ τὸν Ὡρμίσδαν ἔτεκεν ἐκεῖνον καὶ τὸν Σατανᾶν. Therefore the Homa-sacrifice was intended as that by participation in which Zervan probably impregnated himself for the procreation of a son. The Homa-sacrifice rendered the same service to Vivanhvat, the first mortal who pressed out

The six Amschaspands or immortal saints, of whom Ormuzd, the seventh, is also their guide and protecting lord, are powers and properties personified, and hence their names are formed from abstractions. They are called the "benevolent," the "eminently pure," etc., but they appear neither acting as individual beings, nor as such do they lay claim to a special reverence; yet they lead a life of bliss with Ormuzd in Paradise. But as Ahriman created six evil spirits, or Dews, who fought with the Amschaspands, all the twelve presided in turns over the months of the year, in such manner that, every month, the inimical influence of a Dews was opposed to the dominant influence of an Amschaspand, and *vice versâ*. Later on, the importance and world-influence of single Amschaspands came out more prominently. Bohman appeared as king of heaven, and the beasts were called his people. Fire was placed under the protection of Ardibehescht, and Schehriver was guardian chief of the metals; Sapandomad, a female being, the pure daughter of Ormuzd, is the special patron spirit of the earth, Amerdad of the vegetable kingdom, and Khordad of moisture.

The Izeds, or "deserving of worship," are of a more concrete and personal nature than the Amschaspands. Compared with them, indeed, they are designated as inferior genii, and yet are gods in principle, or were so earlier, some of them occupying a very important position in the Persian system. Their characteristics are, in fact, not clearly

the juice of the grape for sacrifice, and thereby earned his son Yima (*Yaçna*, c. 9, in Brockhaus, *Vend. Sade*, p. 409). The middle state in which the doctrine was found about the time of the Macedonian conquest, is seen in the remarkable passage of Eudemus, in Damascius, *de Principiis*, ed. Kopp, p. 184. This Eudemus can be no other than the well-known disciple of Aristotle from Rhodes, whose biography Damascius had composed, and the passage probably is taken from his ἀστρολογικὴ ἱστορία (see Fabric. *Bibl. Græc.* iii. 649, ed. Harl.). Eudemus said the Magians and all the Arians called the intelligible universe and the united (τὸ νοητὸν ἅπαν καὶ τὸ ἡνωμένον, *i.e.* that which exists in the unity of space, air, light, and time), partly place (space or firmament), partly time (Zervan), and they were first to distinguish in him the good god and evil demon, or light and darkness. Here, then, we have Zervan already associated with Ormuzd and Ahriman theogonically, which, however, was not the case in the oldest form of the doctrine, where Zervan appeared as the primitive substance, but impersonal. The later improved myth assumed him to be the supreme god personified, and father of Ormuzd, and at the same time supplied an explanation of the origin of evil, which radically was laid at the door of the divine being.

defined. Single Izeds, as Mithra, Serosch, Behram, and Taschter, were reckoned amongst the Amschaspands, and the cultus was more occupied with them than the other six. The universe of the Parsi being generally filled up with countless personified powers or spirits, good and evil, there are to be found also among the Izeds mere personifications of ideas or virtues, who were addressed as divine beings. Ormuzd has made Mithra greater and brighter than all the other Izeds of heaven; he is next to Ormuzd, and is often invoked along with him; he is the heavenly "courier" with thousand ears and eyes, the attendant of sun and moon, and a brilliant warrior, who overpowers winter, brought in by Ahriman. Taschter (Tistrya, the dog-star) rules in the air, distributes rains, dispenses germs and sap, hurls the lightnings, and animates decaying nature. Three bodies are given him in the *Bundehesch*; he is man, horse, and bull. Behram (Verethragna) was the Ized of victory, particularly of the victorious power of fire.

In the Ferwers (Fravaschis) are combined the notions of guardian angels, divine elements of souls, and heavenly types of created beings. The Ferwer is the most perfect expression in which the thought of the creator, directed upon individual being, has realised itself. The Ferwer existed alone first, but united himself as soul, or portion of soul, with the being which he represented; and is to man the genius who watches over him, both to enlighten and protect.[1] In the latter sense there is even a Ferwer of wood, water, trees, mountains, and flocks, and the gods, too, not excepting Ormuzd, have their Ferwer. They form together a strong celestial host, shielding the creations of the good god against the evil. They come down upon the earth, hear the prayers of pure men, and bear them to the feet of Ormuzd.[2] It is also said of the whole course of the world, as ordered by God, "all this is and took place, that the Ferwers (of men), and therefore their souls, might shine in glory and beauty after death." The believer, if the evil one threatens him mightily, shall say the formula, "I extol, praise, and love the pure, strong, and excellent Ferwer"; then shall the living saints, the dead, and they

[1] Burnouf, *Comm. sur le Yaçna*, p. 270. [2] *Z. A.* ii. 259, 286.

who are to be, give glory and splendour, and make and preserve all alive. And in reality even the Ferwers of future generations were invoked, "the Ferwers of all who should come to die till the appearance of Sosiosch."

Zoroaster undoubtedly found the worship of elements in vogue amongst his Arians. Though Ormuzd, the free, personified, creating god, was made into a centre of the Parsi system of religion, still the worship of the elements was so marked a feature of the religion after its fusion with Magism, that, later on, Christians were persecuted because they refused to invoke fire and water along with the sun. Now, as all that was made by Ormuzd is good, pure, and beneficent, it was certainly not the fear-inspiring aspect of the elements and their destructive power which the Parsi had in view in the cultus he bestowed on them, but only their kindly operation. Fire and water, said the Zend writings, as holy elements pertaining to Ormuzd, kill no man, destroy nothing of the creation of Ormuzd, but only attract to themselves particles belonging to that god.[1] It was pre-eminently the worship exhibited to fire, that, along with the sun-worship, appeared to strangers the essential and most striking feature of the Persian religious sacrifice. To whatever god the Persians sacrifice, Strabo said, they always pray to fire first, which they always keep up without allowing it to be extinguished.[2] The Parsi said, "Fire is the purest and brightest element, impregnated with that which is divinest in nature—light. It is much more sublime than air, water, and earth.[3] Fire is the spark of life in man, the conductor of lights, the all-purifying power of nature."

Fire is styled in the *Zendavesta* the son of Ormuzd, the quickest of the saintly mortals. The worship of fire was the worship of life, purity, and light. "In order that thy prayer be heard," said Ormuzd, "thou must pray to fire, the mighty king." According to the latter sagas, Zoroaster received the fire to be worshipped from heaven; it burnt without being fed, and the hand on which it burnt remained unconsumed.[4] Ormuzd told him it had been

[1] *Vendid.* v. 24–34, p. 104, Spiegel. [2] Strabo, pp. 732, 733.
[3] See the passages in Wilson, *The Parsi Religion*, Bombay, 1843, p. 199.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 204.

produced from out of the divine glory. According to ancient belief, there were in general five kinds of holy fire: the three first of these had their sacred seat in Dadgahs, or the places of fire, and the three oldest mythical kings, founders of the Arian civilisation and political order, already in their time practised and extended the worship of fire, and erected fire-piles. Thus the Zend writings are quite full of addresses to, and encomiums of, fire, and one observes with what predilection the old Parsis plunge into the contemplation of this element and its qualities. They, who saw the combat of two powers in the whole circle of nature; they, to whose imagination the opposition of pure and impure was being continually presented,—marvelled at the conquering, all-destroying power in fire, and recognised in it the mightiest weapon of Ormuzd, the element, with illuminating and warming energy, of which all beauty, instinctive power, and capacity for supporting life in nature is associated, and which appears to approximate closest to the being of God.

Hence, to supply the fire with wood and perfumes[1] for its maintenance, was specially meritorious, and had the promise of blessing on herds, fields, and posterity. "He who ministers to me dry wood, that I may burn brightly," said the fire, "is holy and great, and purifies his actions of their rust." Thus the Parsi had in the kindling and keeping up of the holy fire an ever-imperious duty of religion to fulfil, an obligation, urgent even at nighttime. The night was accordingly divided into three portions; at the beginning of each the fire said, "I long for aid; let them bring me pure wood."[2] And the catalogue of sins that could be committed against the fire was a large one. It was a crime to feed it with unwashed hands, to supply it with green or moist wood, to quench or pour water upon it, to blow it with the mouth, or throw unclean or dead things into it. Such acts, at least according to the statement of Herodotus, were punished with death.[3] Those, on the other hand, earned a great reward who brought fire used for trade and other uses of life to a Dadgah, a consecrated fireplace, to undo the profanation that had been inflicted

[1] *Vendid.* xix. 134, p. 252, Spiegel.
[2] *Ibid.* xviii. 43 sqq. p. 231, Spieg.
[3] Herod. i. 138.

upon it. Then the fire was so sensitive that it at once became contaminated by the mere approach of an unclean thing without contact, *e.g.* a woman in a menstruous state; and so defilement ensued from a man's using wood of a tree on which a bird had settled that had pecked at a corpse. The Zend law was well stored all through with such tormenting situations.

The laborious, harassing, and time-consuming service which the Parsis devoted to the fire was not claimed for the other elements; and yet water also and earth required observance of purity. If Greek accounts are true, the Persians did not tolerate any one washing face or hands in the water of a river, or spitting into it, or turning in anything considered impure. The salt sea-water seems to have been regarded differently. Meanwhile water was indispensable for rites of lustration, and was properly prepared for the purpose. The earth, too, was to be honoured, invoked, and kept clean. The man sinned against it who made a fertile field waste, or left a barren one unsown, if he stood on it with bare foot, or buried a corpse in it, and did not fill up the holes in which the beasts of Ahriman housed.[1]

The worship of the sun was unquestionably primeval among the Arians, and the sun with its light and its central fire was to the Parsi the most sublime object of the visible world, and the eye of Ormuzd. When it appeared surrounded by thousand Izeds from heaven, darting forth light and heat, earth and water and the people of the saints became pure by it; if it did not come forth, the Dews would destroy everything. Three times a day prayer was addressed to the sun: a purifying power was also ascribed to moon and stars next after the sun; hence the defiled person was to let the light of the stars shine upon him nine nights long.[2] A worship of their own was not given to them; but they were invoked like other creatures, the clean beasts for instance: the dog-star, Tistrya or Taschter, as the dispenser of rain, was the only exception. It was probably owing to the Chaldeo-Babylonian creed that a magic or fantastic influence upon the course of events, and the destinies of man, was attributed to the stars at a later

[1] *Vend.* iii. 22 sqq. p. 80, Spieg.

[2] *Vendid.* xix. 78, p. 248, Sp.

period. It is said in the *Minokhered*,[1] "all good and all evil incident to man and other creatures reaches them from the seven and the twelve," the latter being the signs of the zodiac, or the twelve leaders of hosts, to whom, with sun and moon, Ormuzd has committed all good; but the seven are the stars Ahriman has opposed to them, in order to frustrate the good they do.

The whole cycle of earthly things, according to the Irânian doctrine, embraces a world-year of twelve months, *i.e.* twelve thousand years. This time is divided into four periods, each of three thousand years. The opposition and struggle of the two principles from one period to another is developed in accurately measured cycle. As the cycle runs, the real nature of Ahriman is displayed in jealousy and envy. He hates the creatures produced by his rival, and the good itself, for it is Ormuzd who causes it and protects it. In no way does he appear originally, as already remarked, in the character of sovereign of a kingdom of his own; but later on we find him turned into a king of darkness, dwelling with troops of his own spirits, in a kingdom of his own, not accessible to or conquerable by Ormuzd; and making irruptions from his own jurisdiction into that of his rival, plundering, wasting, and defiling. According to the *Bundehesch*, during this first period of the world, when light and darkness as yet were not, he lay for dead, and fettered in his kingdom of gloom; but when he arose up and threatened to swallow up the light, he was unable to endure its splendour and beauty. He then created the troops of evil spirits, Dews, Darvands, and Daroudjs, with whom he burst into the empire of Ormuzd, and attacked his creation. All that is physically and morally hurtful or impure comes from these spirits of evil; they aim at causing a general destruction; they aim at diminishing the number of subjects in the kingdom of Ormuzd, by impeding procreation and increase; keep off the rain, bind the waters, spread drought and barrenness, multiply noxious beasts and poisonous plants, and rouse the withering winds and wasting hurricane. All that is putrefying and corrupting they love, and throw themselves upon with hot eagerness.

[1] In Spiegel's "Stud. über das Zendav.," *Zeitschr. f. die D. M. Gesellsch.* vi. 80.

Thus, then, in the entire of nature there is a general mixture of evil with good, of noxious with useful, of impure with pure, and every creature, in any one imperfection or taint adhering to it, bears upon itself the mark of Ahriman and his Dews. That the pure fire is deformed by black and noxious smoke, that with the good and useful beasts an infinite number of "Kharfester," vermin and unclean beasts, are afoot, is all the work of the spirits of the dark abyss. Man nevertheless, in all his divisions of race, is alone the production of the good god. There is no trace in the Zend writings of man made by Ahriman, but a great deal about the Dews' servants, under which signification seem to be comprehended all who do not serve Ormuzd according to the Persian law, but worship other gods.

As Ahriman brought physical evils—winter, parching heats, storms, beasts of prey, worms, and sicknesses—upon the world, so he is also the author of moral evil, of debaucheries, which prey upon and waste life's core, of laziness, lying, and unbelief. One of his Dews is the wicked Buschiankta, who betrays men into long sleeping and sloth; Eschem, the spirit of rage and envy; Buiti, that of lies and falsehood; Aschmopf, the demon of hypocrisy; Dewesch, the Dew of error and seduction. But the Zoroastric law does not lavish so much attention on any of the Dews as upon Daroudj Nesosch, who enters as a fly into human corpses just after death, and also makes himself master of everything that comes into contact with the dead person; and who, when driven by purifications from one part of the body, immediately fastens on another, until at last his complete expulsion is compassed; all this is described in the minutest details.

For three thousand years the still uninhabited earth remained free from all evil; in the three subsequent thousand years the earth was populated; and still was Ahriman disabled from polluting and disturbing the pure creation with his poison; not till the expiration of these six thousand years could he succeed in that effort. The system of Zoroaster, as it appears in its latest form, the *Bundehesch* (first composed under the Sassanidæ), has thrown the origin of living creatures into the myth of the primeval bull Goschurun, whom Ahriman killed, but out of

whose right side Kaiomorts, the first man, issued, whilst from the tail came seed-plants and trees, from his blood the vine, and from his seed the different kinds of beasts. Thus this death of the bull was turned into a rich source of blessing to the earth, and to man, and to the slayer himself. For while the bull entered into heaven, *i.e.* his seed was conveyed into the moon-heaven, not only everything on earth will be preserved, but at the end of the world the worst of the Darvands, the wicked liar Ahriman himself, is to become holy and heavenly, and offer to Ormuzd a long sacrifice of praise.[1] Kaiomorts too was killed by one of the Dews; but from his seed a tree of double stem grew up, the fruit of which, through creative power of Ormuzd, became the human pair, Meschia and Meschiane, the parents of the entire race of man.

Man was placed in the world to be king of this period and to subdue the Dews.[2] His soul is of heavenly origin; when the body is formed in the womb, the soul descends from heaven and unites itself with it.[3] Is this soul descending from heaven the Ferwer of the man, or are soul and Ferwer two distinct beings, so that the Ferwer is exterior to man and in the relation of guardian spirit to him? The question is a difficult one to decide by the Zend writings. Should the latter be adopted, the Persian notion must at the same time have been, that after the return of the soul into heaven, the Ferwer of the man and his soul continued to exist for eternity as two separate beings. Of such an idea as this at least a trace should have been discoverable in the Zend writings. If the Parsi prays daily to all the Ferwers, those who have been, are now, and are still to be, and if it is said these troops of Ferwers hurry up to assist the person praying, yet they are not distinct from the souls of men.

Heaven was destined for man, when he should be pure in thought, word, and deed. But at the beginning of his history stands the fall and the sin. It began with error and folly in the reason, and ripened in the act. At the outset Meschia and Meschiane said, "It is Ormuzd from whom all good comes." But in the event Ahriman got possession of their minds, deformed their souls, and suggested

[1] *Z. A.* i. 2, p. 164. [2] *Ibid.* ii. 26, p. 350. [3] *Ibid.* i. 2, pp. xxvii. 220.

to them it was he who had made water, earth, trees, and all that was good. They believed these lies, and so doing became Darvands; thereupon they sinned in eating forbidden food; they tasted of the milk of a goat, and ate the fruits of Ahriman's creation, which the Dew gave them.[1] Hence there remained to them but one of the hundred advantages they enjoyed.

It has been lately maintained[2] that the Parsis accounted the human body perfectly pure in itself, and that the notion of an inherited impurity was a stranger to them. But as treading on the earth with bare feet defiled it, and as fire was polluted by the breath or spittle of man it follows that the human body must have been regarded as already in itself impure. No one, too, makes the soul of man since the fall continue pure and innocent. The Daroudj whispered the accursed word into the child's ear, and the betrayed child said after him, "Ahriman is the true god."[3]

The old saga tells of a happy golden time when Yima, the son of Vivanhvat, who indeed refused to be prophet of the doctrine of Ormuzd, was lord of the empire of the earth, still free from all evil. There was neither icy wind nor glowing heat, neither darkness nor death, and no separation yet amongst men. But when man began to suffer from winter, snow, and failing harvests, Yima, at the command of Ormuzd, formed a paradise, wherein he stored the germs of all things and the most excellent of men.[4] There was no cold nor hot wind, no death and no corruption;[5] eternal light shone there, and men lived the happiest of lives. The most striking feature of this Arian paradise, so nearly akin to the Old-Testament Eden, is, that this Eden does not exist at the first beginning of the human race, but a select band of the human race, when already developed, enter into the enjoyment of it. The ceasing or disappearance of this Eden is also equally unaccounted for.

[1] *Z. A.* ii. pp. 377, 378.
[2] Rhode, p. 399, and Dunker, p. 391, against Anquetil, Kleuker, and others.
[3] *Z. A.* ii. 378, 598.
[4] Roth, "The Saga of Dschemschid," *Zeitschr. d. D. M. Ges.* xiv. 418 sqq.
[5] *Vend.* ii. 46–129, pp. 73 sqq. Spieg.

The Parsi religion, more than any other form of heathenism, required of men a constant activity, an unintermitted use of their bodily powers, and a never-slackening vigilance. The earth is the real arena on which the two powers Ormuzd and Ahriman measured their strength; man is also called upon to share in the great struggle against Ahriman and his Dews; and again, it is against men principally that the efforts of the evil spirits are unceasingly directed. The Parsi sustained this combat in particular by putting to death as many as he could of the animals of Ahriman's creation—beasts of prey, lizards, tortoises, frogs, serpents, ants, and vermin. The Athravas, the priests, always went about armed with a stick to kill these beasts with; and, according to Agathias,[1] it was part of the solemnity of the great festival in Persia that every one should kill a quantity, and bring them to the Magians as a proof of his piety. The penances imposed for certain transgressions consisted in the destruction of a fixed number of beasts. Filling up the holes in which they lived was even of religious obligation.

On the other hand, the dog was the most privileged and honoured of animals; in many respects put on an equal footing with men, and in some even preferred to him. It was as joint-combatant against the Kharfester, and as protector of the flocks and herds, and because his mode of life resembled that of the priests in many respects, that so high a worth was recognised in him. To give bad meat to a dog was a sin to be done penance for by blows; whoever struck a dog was to die a miserable death. To strike a water-dog would be one of the most grievous sins a Parsi could commit. The book of the law was more taken up with the duties of men to dogs than towards their fellow-men; and yet there were punishments fixed as heavy even as mutilation for a dog injuring others.

From the grave importance with which this religion invested all that regarded the body and animal functions, the duty of prayer also came to be combined with such things. The Parsi was to pray when he sneezed, when he cut his nails or hair, while preparing meals, day and night, at the lighting of lamps, etc. Ormuzd was first of all invoked,

[1] Agath. ii. 24.

and then not only heaven, earth, elements, and stars, but trees and beasts: prayer was even directed to a man's own soul as Ferwer. In the prescribed formulæ of prayer the encomiastic enumeration of all the names and qualities of Ormuzd, and other gods, forms the principal ingredient. It was determined precisely how often each formula should be repeated—some twenty times on particular occasions, others as much as twelve hundred times.[1] If it were intended to avert the evil influence of the impure Aschmog, the recitation of the Jescht to the pure Serosch had to be continued three days and three nights without interruption.[2] There were also precise directions as to what quarter of the world one should pray, in what position, sitting or kneeling, squatting or standing. Particular prayers, besides, were to be addressed to the patron-spirit of each day, and to fire and water as often as they were approached. To certain formulæ a magic power of keeping bodily evil at a distance was ascribed. There was also a prayer which was fastened upon the left arm of a child when it was frightened, ill, or had bad eyes; another was uttered upon drinking-water that was offered to a barren woman, or one in labour.

The Parsi sacrificial rite presents the significant distinctions from those of other rites, that no burnt-offering found place in it, because this would have been a sin against fire; also nothing of the beast offered was set apart for the deity. The owner took it back whole for his own use after it had been slain by the priest. The deity, they thought,—so the Greek account tells us,—desires nothing of the beast of offering but the soul that dwells in his blood; hence the priest in sacrificing let his hand rest so long on the beast till the blood gushed forth, and the breath of life departed.[3] Yet the expression is also found that head, tongue, left ear and left eye, are the parts of the beast of sacrifice most acceptable to the deity,[4] though without information how these parts were specially appropriated to him. By a prescription of the legal code a thousand head of small cattle were brought to sacrifice as an atonement for certain transgressions:[5] the flesh must

[1] *Z. A.* ii. 7. 129.
[2] *Ibid.* i. 2, p. 364.
[3] Strabo, xv. p. 732; Herod. i. 132.
[4] *Z. A.* i. 2, p. 118, ii. p. 128.
[5] *Vend.* 18. 137, 138, 143. It is said here, "Of all cattle let him bring the

have gone (one would think) to the priests. Flowers, fruits, incense, milk, oil, and small loaves were in like manner presented to the gods; and the latter fell to the priests. According to the statement of Herodotus, the Persians sacrificed on the highest peaks of mountains.[1] The reading of the law formed the other essential part of the liturgy. It was a sacrifice which was to be offered to the primal word Honover, incorporated in the law and uttered by Ormuzd himself, and daily food for the deity, who came thereby in communion with Honover, and through him with Ormuzd.

But the Persians had yet another sacrifice, in some measure the principal one and the most ordinary, as it could be performed in every house. This was the remarkable Homa sacrifice, so characteristic of the religion. This drink, the Soma extolled *usque ad nauseam* in the Indian Vedas for its marvellous effects, was prepared from the milky juice of a herb (asclepias) expressed by rubbing it, with religious ceremonies accompanying. It was mixed with whey, wheat, and another meal, and brought into a state of fermentation: after a libation had been made of it upon the hearth, goblets were filled with it, and it was drunk by the sacrificer, and produced a narcotic intoxicating effect. The visions which the old Parsis enjoyed in the state of ecstatic intoxication into which they were thrown by this liquor, made a lasting and powerful impression on their imaginations. The Zoroastric deification of nature produced this effect, that everything they saw and felt when in this condition appeared to them as a confirmation and completion of their religious creed: the juice, which had so blest an operation, seemed to them the noblest of the life-giving powers of nature, to be the divinity dwelling in her; and thus Homa, the sap and the sacrifice, became itself a genius or god.

It was thus the old Thracians and Hellenes experienced the blissful operation of the god in the intoxicating fumes

small kind for sacrifice to the fire in purity and goodness" (Spiegel, p. 239); the sense requiring that these animals should be offered to the deity of fire, but not implying actual consumption by fire, as afterwards, v. 143, it is commanded to offer a sacrifice of flesh to water.

[1] Herod. vii. 43.

of the wine, and the prophetic enthusiasm which the favour of Dionysos then communicated to them. Thus in later times the Assassines (Haschischin), drunk with the juice of hyoscyamus, saw in their ecstatic half-dreamy state dazzling pictures that seemed to them a foretaste of paradise, and inspired contempt of death, and converted them into blind and desperate tools of the old man of the mountain.[1] The effects of their Homa-juice were to the Parsi the orgiastic side of his religion, and a never-failing portion of it wherever a deification of nature's powers had place. The Homa-drink was the sacrament of their religion, nay more, it was the medium through which the deity manifested itself; and much of the *Zendavesta* has doubtless flowed originally from this source. When, at the foundation of the Sassanid dynasty under Ardeschir Babekan, the restoration of the pure Zoroastric doctrine, then much obscured and disfigured through the Macedonian conquest, was in agitation, recourse was had again to these means. A Magian, Ardai-Virasp, threw himself by the drink into an ecstatic state that lasted several days; and on his awaking told what he had heard from Ormuzd and seen in the other world. This authority was decisive; the Magian sect of the Magusæi, whose influence was then at its height, was thenceforward looked upon as heretical.[2]

Thus, in the eyes of those who were indebted to it for a condition of such bliss and revelations so heavenly, Homa was a god and vivifying spirit of nature. He appeared to Zoroaster as the most perfect of beings, with a beautiful luminous body, and made himself known to him as the one who keeps death at a distance. "Call on me," he said to him, "press out my juice, that you may enjoy me." The noblest gifts of life were ascribed to it; it is the core of life, and was before Zoroaster the first harbinger of his law.[3] Zoroaster asked six gifts from Homa: immortality, firmness, health of body, long life,

[1] See Hammer's *Geschichte der Assassinen*, pp. 212 sqq.

[2] Faucher, in *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscr.* vol. xxxi. p. 453, and vol. xxxix. p. 725. Ardai-Virasp is included in the select souls or saints in the Jescht-Sade's, in the character of "pure Ferwer," *Z. A.* ii. 53.

[3] Comp. the *Dabistan*, ed. Troyer, i. p. 355 n.

victory over his enemies, and protection against their unforeseen attacks. Already the oldest fathers of the races and the heroes had worshipped it, and through its grace and operation had received their sons, founders of a fortunate primeval time, extirpators of the hateful brood of Ahriman. Zoroaster himself was presented to his father Purusaspa by the grace of Homa; for, as is said in the *Bundehesch*, "Homa gives not only health but generative vigour also, and imparts life in the resurrection."[1]

Thus the Parsi praised even the clouds and the water, which help the growth of the body of Homa (the asclepias plant) on the mountain summits, the earth which bears Homa, the soil it springs from in its fragrance. When Ahriman asked Zoroaster with what weapon he and the creatures created good would strike his (Ahriman's) creatures, the prophet replied, "The mortar (in which the Homa-plant was pounded), the vessel (from which it was pressed), Homa, and the word which Ormuzd spoke; these are my best weapons."[2] Plutarch, who speaks of the plant "Omomi," and was acquainted with the use the Persians made of it, says they pounded the herb Omomi in a mortar, whilst calling on Hades and the darkness, and then mixed it with the blood of a slaughtered wolf, and took it to a place the sun never shone upon, and poured it away. As the wolf was reckoned a beast of the Ahrimanic creation, this was therefore that mingling of blood between Ormuzd and Satan of which Theodore of Mopsuestia had treated;[3] a rite no ground for which is discoverable in the Zend writings, and which must rather have appeared to the old and firm disciples of Zoroaster a desecration and a crime. And yet it resulted naturally from the dualistic view of the world as later developed. In this sacrifice, then, the blending of the two principles, as evidenced in the whole of nature, was consummated, and at the same time the effort made to induce so powerful a being as Ahriman to show himself well disposed, or less

[1] Burnouf, "Etudes sur la Langue et sur les Textes Zends," in the *Journ. Asiat.* 1840 sqq. Quatremère, "Mém. sur la divinité Védique Soma," in the *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscr.* 1851, xix. pp. 326 sqq. Fr. Windischmann, in the *Abh. d. phil. Cl. der Bayer-Akad.* 1847, iv. p. 428.

[2] *Vendid.* xix. 28–31, p. 254, Spieg.

[3] *Ap. Phot. Bibl. cod.* 81, περὶ τῆς αὐτῶν αἱμομιξίας.

hostile, may have had something to do with it. Ormuzd himself, at the outset, offered the Homa-drink to his great adversary.[1]

The Parsis, then, had in the Homa a sacrifice which had at once the plenary signification of a sacrament and a communion imparting a fellowship with the deity. With them the "Miezd" formed a second sacrament and sacrifice united, consisting of flesh-meat with bread and fruit, which was blessed and then eaten. These sacramental offerings, however, seem to have had no particular connection with the religious festivals of the Parsis, which, in accordance with the character of the Zoroastric doctrine, were mere feasts of nature and creation. There were six of these great feasts every year, each of five days, kept in memorial of the creation of heaven, earth, the trees, beasts, and man. This was the way certainly people came to convert the different periods of time into as many spirits, and worshipped them — in fact, made each day religiously sacred; and there were spirits of the six epochs of the year, or the "Gahanbar"; as also spirits of the months, and genii of the days of the month.

Continuous prayers had to be offered for deceased relations, and twice as many for those who had died not pure, but in sin, as for the pure.[2] These prayers obtained for the soul the help of the heavenly spirits, and particularly of Serosch, against Ahriman. The five intercalated days which completed the Persian year of three hundred and sixty days, were celebrated as a festival of souls. The belief was, that on these days souls appeared again on earth and visited their families, and that Ormuzd released the souls of penitent sinners from the habitation of Darudj: two formulæ of prayer had to be repeated twelve hundred times during them.

Following the original character of their creed, the Parsis had no images or temples of their gods; for, as Herodotus expresses it, they did not believe that the gods resembled men, as the Greeks did. This was altered afterwards. The priests were called in the *Zendavesta* "Athrava," or, the provided with fire. They bore a variety of names, relating to their functions of sacrificing, stirring

[1] *Z. A.* i. 11. 404. [2] *Vendid.* xii. 9 sqq. p. 183, Sp.

the fire, washing and purifying:[1] all were obliged to be furnished with mortar and bowl for the Homa sacrifice; with the serpent-stick for killing unclean beasts; and with the Paitidoma, this last being a cloth with which they veiled the lower part of the face during the sacred ministrations, to prevent their breath defiling the fire. The Athrava ought also to study and learn his religion during the night;[2] should be a doer of good, like the dog; contenting himself with everything, and, like the dog, keeping such things at a distance as would contaminate him. Persons, too, who were not Athravas were allowed, it appears, to practise purifications; for, it is said, such as do so must have learnt the law from a purifier. Whoever attempted such an act without the necessary instruction, struck the place where the sin happened with barrenness; and in consequence of his sacrilege ought to do penance by death.[3]

In historical times, when the doctrine of Zoroaster had spread in a westerly direction, we find the Magians stepping into the place of the Athravas, as representatives of the Zend priesthood; and it is evident that the interpolation of the old Arian religion with Chamitic and Western Asiatic ingredients, of which there are traces many and various since the days of Herodotus, is to be ascribed to the influence of the Median priesthood, who originally belonged to the last-mentioned religious circle. In spite of the great Arian reaction under Darius Hystaspes, the syncretic spirit of magism, in so widely spread and influential a corporation, seems again to have got the upper hand. Even their political importance, under the later Achæmenidæ and Arsacidæ, was great. According to Posidonius, there were two senates assessors of the king, of which the Magians formed one.[4] The priests were also charged with the education of the princes; and the heir to the throne had to submit to an examination, as to his acquisition of the requisite knowledge from their instructions.[5] Their science embraced theology, cosmology, and knowledge of nature; and Philo bestows upon them no scant meed of praise for their laborious investigation of

[1] *Vendid.* v. 162, p. 144, Sp. [2] *Ibid.* xviii. 14–17, p. 229, Sp.
[3] *Z. A.* i. pt. ii. p. 385; *Vendid.* ix. pp. 172–180, 187–196.
[4] Strabo, xi. p. 515. [5] Plat. *Alcib.* i. p. 122.

nature, and the deep insight they had gained into her.[1] Interpretation of dreams, soothsaying, healing of diseases, in which liturgical formulæ were combined with medicinal, formed part of their operations. Their most brilliant period began with the fall of the Arsacidæ, when Babek and Ardeschir, of the Magian race of the Sassanidæ, attained to the sovereign power. They were divided into three classes, Herbeds (disciples), Mobeds, and Destur Mobeds (perfect masters, or arch-priests); and those of the first class only ate meal and vegetables,[2] if it was not a special sect devoted to the doctrine of metempsychosis, who practised this abstinence.

Sanctity existed in the Parsi religion as well as purity, and the purity was eminently a physical one. Care for its maintenance, or recovery, demanded all the vigilance and activity a Parsi could command, and filled up no small portion of his time. Not but that purity of soul, the abstaining from all works that might stain it, was expressly required as well. A man's thoughts were also to be pure; and they are so, when occupied with the beginning of things, *i.e.* the creation.[3] The works specially recommended are, to promote marriages, to support the poor, to instruct the ignorant, to feed cattle: these wound the death-demon to the quick, like arrows shot into him. The best occupation, and the one most pleasing to the deity, is agriculture. Whoever cultivates the fruits of the field, cultivates purity and furthers the law of Mazdayas.[4] Where the fruits of the field thrive, there the Dewas hiss, disappear, and fly away to hell. Irrigation and tilling of the soil, and multiplying stock by breeding from it, are the things most acceptable to the earth. Amongst duties of the highest rank was the continual wearing of a girdle (Costi), to be used by all men and women. It protected the believers against the Dewas, and is for them an unfailing means of, and security for, blessedness. In the *Vendidad*, Ormuzd mentions as signs whereby one may discern evil men doomed to death the disuse of the girdle during the three watches of the night, and the teaching a sinful law.[5]

[1] Phil. *de Spec.* 792; *Quod omnis probus*, etc. 876.
[2] Eubul. *ap. Porphyr. de Abst.* iv. p. 165.
[3] *Z. A.* i. 140.
[4] *Vendidad*, see Spieg. iii. 99.
[5] *Ibid.* xviii. 21–23.

Insolence, ingratitude, lying, cheating, breaking a promise, sloth, and rape, unnatural lust are vices particularly denounced by the *Zendavesta*. Thieves, pursuing their trade by night, are companions of the black Dewas: neither prayer nor good works can atone for their misdeeds; that can only be done by pardon from the injured parties. Lying and cheating are at once a defilement[1] and a sin against Mithra. The Persians learnt the vice of paiderastia from the Greeks, Herodotus tells us. But in the *Vendidad*, Hyrcania is mentioned as a country in which this vice, for which there is no atonement, and which makes a man into a very Dewa, was already practised.[2] At a later period it had no small share in the downfall of the nation and the empire.

The position which marriage occupied in the Parsi religion was a peculiar one. There is no rule in the *Zendavesta* as to the number of wives a man may take to himself. Anquetil's assertion that monogamy received religious sanction, contradicts the distinct testimony of the Greeks that the Persians had many regular wives, and a number of concubines besides; for they held it to be good and honourable to be parents of many children. In fact, it is a very late source, the Sadder, which contains the regulation that a man should only have one wife, and only in case of her sterility should be allowed to take a second.[3] The procreation of the greatest possible number of children was looked on as particularly meritorious, "for children are a bridge leading to heaven." A Persian should have intercourse with his wife at least every nine days,[4] and there was nothing the Persian eschewed so much as voluntary celibacy. A maiden remaining unmarried from her own choice only till her eighteenth year, is threatened with the heaviest punishments after death; so soon as she is marriageable she should ask a husband of her parents. Marriages between first cousins were recommended; and the unanimous testimony of the ancients leaves no doubt on the head that even incestuous connections with mothers, sisters, and daughters were of not uncommon occurrence.[5] Bardesanes says, that in his time (the second century after Christ)

[1] *Vend.* iv. 4–53.
[2] *Vend. Farg.* viii. 102–6, p. 146, Spieg.
[3] *Z. A.* ii. 561, 611.
[4] *Z. A.* ii. 562.
[5] Sotion, *ap. Diog. Laert. prœm.* 7; Strabo, p. 735; Agath. ii. 24.

such marriages still took place, not only in Media, but also among the posterity of Persian settlers in Egypt, Phrygia, and Galatia.[1]

The continual repetition of purifying ceremonies *ad infinitum* was, in the variety and facility of defilement, of the most sacred and urgent obligation to the Parsi. The urine of oxen and water mixed, with formulæ of prayer and imprecations, constituted the principal means of purification;[2] but the use of the first should always precede, followed by drying it off with dust or earth. If a Parsi, being legally impure, washed himself with water, the pure and holy element, the armour given by Ormuzd to men, was thereby defiled, and a grievous sin committed. The new-born child was washed three times in ox-urine and once in water. Some purifications were to be taken daily; the most effective, but most penal of all, was continued nine nights through. For these and many others a priest was needed, and if he conducted them properly, all was well; but if the purifier, after the business was concluded, went off in ill-humour and discontent,—suppose for the insufficiency of his recompense,—there followed forthwith a worse contamination, through the Druckhs, the evil spirit of unclean livers. In case the purifier were not sufficiently instructed as to the law, then evil multiplied itself upon the earth, the land was stricken with barrenness, and he himself paid the penalty by death.[3]

The purifications, however, were not adequate to crimes; for these the *Zendavesta* is full of punishments, consisting of innumerable blows. Ormuzd himself appointed their number and degrees, and the instrument to be used in inflicting them, in a number of cases including even involuntary acts. And these decisions point to a state of theocracy firmly administered, and lording it over the whole of life through religion. Expiations or works of penance in proportion to the greatness of the sin were necessary to be undergone, in order to reconciliation with the deity, and to avert future punishments: such works were, cutting wood for feeding the holy fire; the binding together of barsam-bundles; killing a great number of serpents, tortoises,

[1] *Ap. Eus. Pr. Evg.* vi. 10, pp. 275, 279.
[2] *Z. A.* ii. 551.
[3] *Ibid.* i. 362.

lizards, ants, mice, and gnats; destroying many impure holes of Ahrimanic beasts in the earth; and furnishing the implements of their calling for priests, soldiers, and farmers; and the transfer to pure men—*i.e.* those of the same religion—of a stream, a field, a house, or a maiden to wife, for the soul's good.

As everything not pertaining to Ormuzd, and the gods made by him, fell under Ahriman's jurisdiction, and became a service rendered to him and his Dewas, the Parsi religion was necessarily exclusive and intolerant, more than any other form of paganism. A Parsi of strong religious convictions could not associate with the followers of another creed. And yet the *Zendavesta* implied believers in Ormuzd living intermingled with the invokers of Dewas or worshippers of strange gods. Worshippers of Ormuzd wishing to become physicians, should practise first, the *Vendidad* says, on the worshippers of Dewas. Should their sick die three times successively, they are incapacitated for ever from practising; but if they have recovered three followers of Dewa, they may then employ their skill upon the faithful of Ormuzd. Calumnious depreciation of a "pure man" to one of another belief is a very heavy sin. Those who mix themselves up with Dewa worshippers should be put to death sooner than poisonous serpents, wolves, and lizards.[1] To the Parsi, the sight of believers in other religions, and of the endless impieties they perpetrated on the holy elements, was intolerable; and this the Christians experienced at a later day, when they were upbraided for having used water for filthy purposes, killed animals without distinction, and buried corpses. Cambyses in Egypt, and Xerxes in Hellas, gave terrible expression to the Persian hate of strange gods. But, upon the whole, they were accustomed, as rulers, to spare the religions of their subjects, partly from policy, partly because the Persian religion had long since ceased to be that of the old Zend writings, and had become a worship mixed up with the ritual forms of Western Asia.

In no point was the Zoroastric legislation so vexatious and intricate as in the province of death and the treatment of corpses. The death of a pure man, *i.e.* of a servant of Ormuzd, is a victory to Ahriman; as, *vice versâ*, the death

[1] *Vend.* xviii. 123–133.

of one of Ahriman's creatures is one to Ormuzd. The defilement caused by the corpse is the greater, and extends the further, in proportion as the religious rank of the dead was higher. Hence it was a matter requiring the carefulest and nicest deliberation how to deal with things that had come in contact with dead bodies; and the *Vendidad* contains a volume on the subject, made up of heavy penalties on the transgressor. For example, the simple throwing aside the carcass of a dead dog, or letting it lie, was requited with two thousand blows.[1] As heavy a penalty was incurred by one who covered a corpse with a garment of cotton, or the woven hair of animals, in which a single thread or hair was new. To throw a dead body into the water, to bury or burn it, are actions which are unpardonable; yet the *Vendidad* mentions that in some places the wicked custom still prevailed of burying or burning corpses.[2]

Thus, then, nothing was left for it but arranging matters so that corpses should be exposed in the open field to feed the birds and dogs. But as the earth could not be defiled, it must be inhumed in a spot without trees or water, and the excavation filled up with dust and stones; and here was the place (Dakham) wherein the naked body was laid and made fast. Thus these Dakhams became congregating spots for the Dewas, who were there most fatal to men, and so every one carefully avoided them. In Hyrcania, a particular kind of dog was kept by people, that they might be torn in pieces by them after death; and this was deemed the best kind of sepulture.[3] When the corpse had fallen to pieces and disappeared entirely, the Dakhams were destroyed and levelled. This was one of the most meritorious actions a Parsi could perform, and by it he wiped away all his sins.[4] Hardly anything worse could happen to a believer than to touch a dead body. He must immediately wash himself fifteen times, rub himself with earth as many, and then only could get himself properly purified by any one he met.[5]

Nevertheless, a statement of Herodotus assures us that burying alive was a Persian custom; and he tells us how the Magians in the army of Xerxes had nine living native youths and maidens buried at the nine cross-roads of the

[1] *Vend.* v. 86 sqq. p. 109, Sp. [2] *Ibid.* vi. 53, p. 119.
[3] Cic. *Tusc.* i. 45. [4] *Vend.* vii. 126 sqq. p. 134. [5] *Ibid.* viii. 271 sqq.

Edoni; and further, that Queen Amestris did the same to fourteen children of Persians of rank, as a sacrifice for herself. It is much questioned whether the act really was, in Persian eyes, "an unheard-of profanation of the earth";[1] for it took place by the dead thing coming in contact with the earth, of which dead thing the demon of death, the Druckhs Nasus, had already taken possession. Conformably with Parsi notions, it might very well happen that the Druckhs did not get possession of such as were buried alive. The error of supposing that by a sacrifice of many human lives offered to Ahriman and the Dewas, the demons of death, a man could obtain a respite for his own, might possibly be founded on notions about Ahriman similar to those of the mixing of Homa-juice with wolf's blood, described by Plutarch. The other custom of depositing the bodies of Persian kings, well preserved in metal or stone coffins, and in places of sepulture hewn in the rock, was probably suggestive of nothing offensive to religious feelings, for the earth remained undesecrated.

Though after a man's death the demons take possession of his body, yet on the third day consciousness revives in him. The soul of the just, passing over the heights from which Mithra goes forth and the sun begins his course, reaches the bridge Tschinevad, built by Ormuzd, where he is questioned as to his behaviour in the world of bodies. From thence he is conducted by the heavenly Izeds past the throne of the Amschaspand Bahman, to Gorotman, the habitation of Ormuzd. So the *Vendidad*.[2] According to a representation preserved in one of the later Zend fragments, there appears to the soul on this progress its own law, *i.e.* the reflection of its actions and life, in the shape of a beautiful luminous creature, and says to it: "I am the purity thou hast aimed at, thy pure thoughts, thy pure word, thy pure work."[3] A doctrine of the resurrection is met with at a later time among the Persians, but not in the older Zend writings; therefore it is not Zoroastric:[4] still a kind of Chiliasm seems to have been very early adopted

[1] As Spiegel thinks, *Zeitschr. der D. M. Ges.* ix. 184.

[2] *Vend.* xix. 96 sqq. p. 249. [3] In Rhode, p. 402.

[4] Burnouf, in the *Journ. Asiat.* 1840, x. p. 237; Spiegel, in the *München. Gel. Anz.* 1847, i. 159.

amongst them; for Theopompus, a contemporary of Alexander, states,[1] "when Ahriman at last falls in the contest with Ormuzd, then men will become happy, neither needing food nor casting a shadow" (therefore having glorified bodies); "and then the god who brought this about will repose and take holiday for a time, not long to a god, but moderate as for a man sleeping. Then shall one life, one state, and one language comprehend all blest and happy men." The other expression of the same history shows that those already dead will partake in this kingdom of glory. "The Magians taught that man would revive and become immortal, and that then everything would be formed and endure according to their prayers."[2] Probably the Magians divided upon the doctrine of the end of things a short time before Alexander; for there was a Magian school teaching the metempsychosis,[3] and which therefore did not accept the dogma of the resurrection, which would hardly be reconcilable with it. During the period of the Macedonian and Parthian domination, in which the doctrine of Zoroaster was generally to be met with in a state of decline, the two parties were able to exist by the side of one another. But this state of things changed in the religious reformation at the beginning of the Sassanid dynasty; then the faction in favour of the doctrine of the resurrection prevailed, as that dogma was in better keeping with the spirit of the Parsi religion than the metempsychosis: for as death is Ahriman's work, and the human body, the creation of Ormuzd, is only polluted by Ahriman, the natural inference is, that, by the complete victory over Ahriman, death disappears, the germ of mortality implanted by him in the body is taken away, and man becomes immortal with a fine ethereal body, leads a life of bliss upon an earth for ever freed from the corrupting influence of evil and its Dewas. Thus, then, this creed prevailed; and the sect of the Magusæans, who contemplated the body as the work of Ahriman, and a prison in which the soul was barred as a penance for previous sin, and in consequence denied the resurrection, was rejected and repeatedly condemned.[4] In

[1] *Ap. Plut. Isid.* c. 47.
[2] *Ap. Diog. Laert. proœm.* 8.
[3] Eubul. *ap. Porph. Abst.* iv. 16.
[4] Faucher, in the *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscr.* xxxix. 725, 790.

the *Bundehesch*, the dogma of the resurrection is found, in connection with that of Sosiosch, quite in a developed state.

Sosiosch the prophet, or succourer, who is to be born towards the expiration of the world's course, is mentioned as early as in the *Vendidad*; but only generally, and with the statement that he is to come out of the water Cansoya in eastern quarters.[1] In the *Bundehesch*, however, his portrait is already finished. He appears at a time when wickedness and injustice have got the upper hand amongst men to a fearful degree. He will be preceded by two other prophets, Oscheder Bami and Oschedermah, each to rule a thousand years; but Sosiosch, who comes after them, is then the conqueror of death and the judge of the world. In the might of Ormuzd, he will awaken the dead. Zoroaster hesitatingly asks Ormuzd: "Since wind and water carry off the remains of the body, how shall it be restored again?" But Ormuzd points to his all-mighty powers of creation; and as he is the creator of the grain of corn, which after corruption springs up afresh, so by his power also shall the resurrection take place, and but once in truth, and not a second time. Kaiomorts will first arise, and then Meschia and Meschiana, and after them, within fifty-seven years, all mankind. Sosiosch will give all to drink of white Homa-sap and of that which comes from the bull, and thereby they will become immortal. After the joys of recognition, there follows the separation of the just and unjust by Sosiosch's passing sentence down from an elevated station. There shall father be severed from his wife, sister from brother, and friend from friend. The just shall enter into Gorotman, but the Darvands, the impure, be again hurled down into Duzakh, or hell, the same they occupied after death.[2] But at last a great fire of purification is to break out, the comet Guryscher will precipitate itself upon the earth, and fuse all the metal contained in it; and then all the pure, as well as the Darvands, are to pass through that refining stream of fluid metal, and Ahriman be consumed in it, and Duzakh be purified by it. Evil thenceforth annihilated, all men shall be clothed in heavenly garments, and unite with one another in singing the praise of Ormuzd and the Amschaspands.

[1] *Vend.* xix. 18, p. 244. [2] *Z. A.* ii. 411–416.

We have here to mention a cultus unquestionably of Persian origin, but which seems to have found no sympathy or met with any welcome among the partisans of the Zend doctrine, but rather to have broken its connection with the Parsi creed, come out of it, and gone on its own way. This, the worship of the god Mithras, spread itself from Western Asia, over the Græco-Roman West, in the last times of the Republic, about the year 70 B.C. Introduced into Greece and Italy by the pirates, at that time all-powerful on the Asiatic coasts,[1] it appears in the form of a religion of its own, veiling itself in the mystery of initiatory rites and probations.

This religion, which made converts of many who were indifferent to, or unbelievers in, the other gods, propagated itself by means of the Roman legions in the extreme west and north of the empire, produced a host of monuments, and threw upon the last moments of expiring heathenism the gleam of a mysterious worship, noble and earnest in its ethical teaching.

Mithras was not originally sun-god of the Zend believers. In the *Zendavesta* he is clearly distinguished from the sun, and has his own place in heaven between sun and moon; is called the fructifier and colourer of the parched meadows, the germ of germs, imparting strength to nature and increase to water and trees. He is invoked, where there are herds to multiply the births, and, like Anahita, is a god of fertility, "the lord of life, the head of all creatures,"[2] whom Ormuzd has made greater and brighter than all others, the mediator between him and men, the bond indispensable to the harmony of the world. But in principle he is only Ormuzd himself in his active and energising aspect; for if Ormuzd is god plunged in repose,[3] Mithras is the ever-productive, ever in combat; that is, he is ever unceasingly combating Ahriman, the enemy of heaven and earth and the human race; it is he who preserves the full portion of blessings to Irân; on him the duty has devolved of judging the dead on the bridge Tschinevad; he comes down, too, and watches over the dead, driving from them the king of darkness and the Dews, the author of death and cold.

[1] Plut. *Pomp.* 24.

[2] *Z. A.* i. 180, ii. 227, 609.

[3] *Ibid.* ii. pp. 25, 97, 251, 261, 287.

At the same time, too, Ormuzd has appointed him the chief guardian of all the Ferwers; from him children, health, and purity are derived. In short, he is, so to say, the right arm of Ormuzd, ever executing his will; for everything in creation that befits the good deity according to the Parsi, increase, propagation, opposition to Ahriman and his Dews, are all attributed to him. Had the first man, it was said, sung songs of praise to Mithras and invoked him by name, his soul at death would have instantly entered into the seat of bliss. In general, his relation to Ormuzd is analogous to that between Apollo and Zeus as represented in the Greek drama.

The changes through which the ideas embodied in Mithras gradually passed, no longer admit of being accurately traced in their particulars. There are passages in the *Zendavesta* admitting of hardly any other interpretation than that he was the planet Venus;[1] as when it is said of him that his place for ever in heaven is between sun and moon, that he is their companion, and exalted like the star Taschter; and again, that he multiplies men a hundredfold, or, in general, is the fosterer of life and fertility. On this account he is also frequently represented with the sun's chariot on his right, and the moon's on his left; and in the prayers directed to his honour, he should be invoked at the same time with sun and moon; and, further, the Mithras prayer should be said between the two special prayers addressed to those luminaries.[2]

In other passages, however, Mithras seems to be contemplated as the god of the daylight; for it is there said of him that he appears with the sun, and hurries over the mountain as premier celestial Ized, and is first to occupy the fair summits of the golden peaks.[3] As Anahita, in character of goddess of the heavenly springs, is related to the earthly element of water, so it appears Mithras is connected, as one of the Vedish Aditjas, or deities of the celestial light,—analogous to the ether of the Greeks,—with the visible light of earth, or the clear daylight.[4] Mithras was

[1] Therefore Sylvestre de Sacy adopted it, in the *Mém. de l'Institut*, ii. 213, 1845.

[2] *Z. A.* ii. 15, 16, 204–232.

[3] *Ibid.* i. 418, ii. 207.

[4] Roth, in the *Zeitschr. der M. Ges.* vi. 70.

then Ormuzd in his physical conception; the god to whom belongs the lordship of heaven; the sun, and the day; and, in a somewhat stricter sense, the god of the daylight, and yet always the vicegerent of Ormuzd in this lower sphere, and the subduer of the Ahrimanic powers. The moral position he occupies in the Zend doctrine towards men must necessarily be the consequent of this his physical signification. In course of time, and in Central Asia, Mithras, as the god of light ruling in heaven, gradually became converted into the sun-god, and more and more identified with simple sun-power, coming forth afresh every morning on his course as the invincible sun, overpowering the influences of Ahriman. The time at which this change of Mithras into the sun-god was consummated may be calculated with a considerable degree of probability, and appears to fall somewhere between the years 460–380 B.C. Herodotus, for instance, is not as yet acquainted with any masculine form of Mithras, but only a female Mitra (*i.e.* Anahita), identical with Mylitta, or Astarte; while Xenophon, only eighty years after him, makes the Persian swear by Mithras, but without giving any distinct characteristics of the god. Amongst the inscriptions at Persepolis there is but one in which another god, Mithras, is in fact named along with Ormuzd, and this dates from Artaxerxes Mnemon, the same who had images of Anaitis-Mitra set up in his principal cities. Strabo is the first Greek who specifies of the Persians that Mithras is the sun with them; and the fact recounted by Duris[1] of the monarch being allowed to get intoxicated, and to dance only once a year, on the festival of Mithras, betrays this, that the feast, and therefore the god, had assumed a character foreign to the Zend doctrine, and corresponding in essentials with a West Asian cultus. One sees that, only when the Persians had subjugated the countries beyond the Tigris, and come into contact with the seductive worship of Baal, Mithras was turned into the sun-god; and it is decidedly the same influence which induced a sovereign of a people, so otherwise averse to idols, to erect the images of Anahita. It was also quite natural now, that Mithras and Anahita, nearly akin as they were before, should gradually be drawn closer

[1] *Ap. Athen.* x. 1. 1, p. 434.

together in the relation of Baal and Astarte, so as that a Roman of the fourth century could say the Persians had divided Jupiter into two deities, a male and a female, both gods of fire.[1]

Mithras, as sun-god, now received a mystery worship of his own, doubtless established by Magians, but still by a particular sect, who had their own peculiar tenets, and probably blended Chaldean traditions with Persian. In these mysteries Mithras was a very different being from the Mithras of the *Zendavesta*, not only as sun-god, but also generally. He appears here, not as the Mithras created by Ormuzd, but as a god born out of the rocks,[2] who, partially at least, had put Ormuzd aside and set himself in his place. If the believing Parsi of the *Zendavesta* should be a warm partisan of Ormuzd, the initiated here was consecrated a warrior of Mithras. In the numberless monuments of this rite, he kills a bull which he had stolen; and this carrying off of the bull by the father, Mithras, formed a subject of mystic hymns.[3] The bull, from whose tail ears (of corn) sprout, is the primeval bull of Zoroaster, the source of all living, according to the *Bundehesch.* Fifty-five kinds of corn-plants and twelve kinds of trees issue from this tail. His seed was preserved and purified in the moon after his death, and then fashioned into the various kinds of beasts peopling the earth. Mithras sacrificed this bull, as bearing the germs of all organic beings within himself, and of all the powers of physical life; and from it he communicated being to all individual creatures, which could only proceed from the bull by his death taking place first. The Ahrimanic beasts, serpents and scorpions, appearing on the monuments, would poison the bull and his seed; but the dog belonging to the good creation is also present. As it is remedial to a dying or dead Parsi for a dog to look at him, so the gaze of the dog, here directed upon the dying bull, is a pledge to him of a second birth. His life's core is carried to the moon, and in reality the bull is

[1] Firmic. Mat. c. v. p. 65, Oehler.

[2] Hieron. *adv. Jovin.*, *Opp.* ii. 247; Vallars, *Commod. Instr.* i. 13, p. 141, Oehl.

[3] Firm. Mat. *l.c.*, according to Oehler's amendment.

exhibited on the Mithras monuments in a boat, as he is being carried up to the moon.[1]

In the mysteries, the two celestial revolutions of the fixed and movable stars, and the migrations of souls from one star to another, are represented by the symbol of a step-ladder with seven gates, and an eighth at the top of all, each of them corresponding to one of the planets.[2] These steps are to be found also in the Parsi book *Viraf-Nameh*. Under the conduct of the Ized Serosch, Viraf mounts the rounds of it, and at each round reaches a different heaven, where he meets a number of souls. On the seventh and topmost round he sees Zoroaster sitting on a splendid throne, surrounded by his three sons, and by his side the old heroes and kings of the sagas. In the mysteries Mithras was the conductor of souls in this journey through the planet heaven; but before he was represented as the vanquisher of Ahriman in the world below; so supporting, by monumental evidence, the assertion of the Areopagite, that the Magians, in token of certain hallowed mysteries among the Persians, kept up the memory of the threefold Mithras;[3] for Mithras here really appears in triple character and action,—the imparter of earthly life, or consummator of the sacrifice of the bull upon earth; as the protector of souls in Hades consecrated to him upon earth, and as their guide to bliss through the celestial regions. In this manner Mithras became at last, when the other gods waxed pale, the sheet-anchor to which the hopes of the heathen clung; and even with one who was jealous for the honour of the Hellenic gods, as Julian was, the expectation of a blissful life after death was dependent on the knowledge of "Father Mithras."[4]

The initiation took place in a cavern or grotto, which had a cosmical meaning. Zoroaster was said to have already contrived such a cavern, in which the different

[1] See the monument of Sarmizægethusa and that of Apulum, in the *Mémoires de l'Inst. Acad. des Inscr.* xiv. p. 178, pl. 1 and 2, and the explanations of Lajard, pp. 157 sqq. Hence the precept given to the Parsis of praying to the moon, who is the guardian of the seed of the sole created Bull; *Z. A.* ii. 325, 329.

[2] Cels. *ap. Orig. contr. Cels.* vi. 22, p. 646. Delarue, following the amendment proposed by Bouhereau, κλίμαξ ἑπτάπυλος instead of ὑψίπυλος.

[3] Τὰ μνημόσυνα τοῦ τριπλασίου Μίθρου, ep. 7. [4] Jul. *Cæs.* p. 335.

regions of the world were depicted.[1] The preparatory rite and consecration of the initiated was conducted with numerous ceremonies, referring to the struggles which the Mithras warrior had to undergo in the service of his god. Many probations preceded the reception into the different grades. These probations, in which much that was in other respects foreign to the spirit of the religion of Ormuzd turned up, were directed by Chaldeans, or under their influence. In them, it was said, the tortures of Mithras were principally contemplated;[2] and the *Menippus* of Lucian relates how he had been subjected to trials of the kind by the disciples of Zoroaster at Babylon, whither he had betaken himself in order to be by them conducted to and from Hades.[3] Hunger, thirst, and blows, long wanderings on foot, swimming great sheets of water, passing through fire and ice, sojourning in waste and terrible places, are spoken of. In later times, however, and in the case of rich people, these kinds of probations were certainly not taken in earnest; but in many instances, the ill-treatment must have been very severe indeed, for Gregory of Nazianzum speaks of the scaring by fire as particularly painful; and he compares the tortures of Bishop Mark of Arethusa, who was "dragged through the streets, beaten, and had his hair torn out by the roots, so that there was no limb of his body not tormented," with the inflictions which the postulant has to endure in the mysteries of Mithras.[4] One sees on the monuments,[5] too, that the person to be initiated was frightened by a sword drawn upon him; and to that we may probably attribute the Emperor Commodus's having killed a man at his initiation.[6]

The milder forms of the Mithras initiation-rite consisted in a washing with water, a purification with honey, a mark upon the forehead, and a crown. This latter the mystes was to place upon his own head without trembling at the threatening sword, and immediately remove it from thence to the point of the shoulder, with the words, "Mithras is my god and my crown." On no occasion afterwards was

[1] Eubul. *ap. Porphyr. Antr. Nymph.* c. 6.
[2] Schol. *ad. Greg. Naz. Or. Stylit.* i. n. 6. 47. [3] Luc. *Menipp.* c. 6.
[4] Greg. Naz. *Opp.* i. pp. 109, 123, 680, Paris, 1778.
[5] See the print in Lajard, *l.c.* pl. 6. [6] Lamprid. *Commod.* c. 9.

he ever to wear a garland on his head.[1] An oblation of bread and water seems to have struck Christian writers of after times, as producing a remarkable resemblance to the Christian Eucharist; but was probably not very different from the Parsi communion, in which some of the bread blessed by the priest was eaten and the Homa-juice drunk from the cup. The steps of this initiation were called Raven, Nymphos (Virgin), Warrior (Hercules), Lion, Perseus, Helios, Dromo (Cancer);[2] designations all taken from the star and zodiacal emblems; and these are also introduced on the Mithratic monuments.[3] There is no doubt but at each degree the initiated was assured his entrance into the corresponding region of heaven. The highest grade was that of "Father," and the high-priest was called "Father of Fathers."[4]

Like Mithras, that other Persian deity so nearly related to him, Anahita, extends back into a time before Zoroaster, and she, like him, by her fusion with a West Asian deity, was also subjected to the process of an essential alteration. Ardvisura Anahita, the goddess of the celestial water or primal fount, from which all earthly water wells, is often mentioned in the *Zendavesta*. She drives in a chariot with four horses; Ormuzd himself honours her, though it was he who produced her, and begs her to grant him Zoroaster to be prophet of his doctrine. She purifies what man and woman contribute towards the procreation of a child. Maidens call upon her for vigorous husbands; women pregnant and in labour for a lucky child-bearing;[5] in one word, she is a goddess of fertility and propagation, the female aspect of Mithras. She had herds of holy cows, and on account of her virginity was, in the eyes of the Greeks, the Persian Artemis; while in the same goddess, modified in the fashion of Western Asia, they recognised

[1] Tertull. *Cor. Mil.* c. 15.

[2] Not Bromios, which has caused Schwenck so much perplexity; *Mythol. der Perser*, p. 208.

[3] Hieron. *Ep.* 107, *ad* Lætam, according to the improved text of Vallarsi, *Opp.* i. 678, 679.

[4] Or "Pater Patratus." A certain Ulpius Egnatius bears on an inscription the title of "Pater et Hierocorax Mithræ," Orelli (*Inscript. Lat.* n. 2355), who has wrongly put Hieroceryx instead of Hierocorax.

[5] Fr. Windischmann, "Die Persische Anahita oder Anaitis," München, 1856, in the *Abh. der Bryer Akad.* pp. 29 sq.

their own Aphrodite. Artaxerxes ordered her statue to be erected in Babylon, Susa, Ecbatana, Damascus, and Sardes.[1] Her temple at Ecbatana was still in existence in the time of Antiochus, adorned with extreme splendour, with gilded pillars and silver tiles.

In Armenia, where the religious system corresponded exactly with the Persian, Anaitis—for so the Greeks call her—was in the highest estimation. In an Armenian writer she is styled the "great queen," who is the glory and salvation of the Armenian nation, whom all kings honour, the mother of all wisdom, and benefactress of the whole human race.[2] A cultus of unchastity was also offered to her as goddess of propagation; so that in Akilisene, where her chief sanctuary lay, distinguished Armenians actually dedicated their daughters to her, who remained a length of time with the goddess in a state of prostitution, and then were married; for, observes Strabo, no one is ashamed of being united with a woman of the kind. In striking contrast with this Armenian rite, the priestess of the goddess in Ecbatana was compelled to lead a life of continence; the reason why Artaxerxes appointed the Aspasia, whom he refused to his son, to be her priestess there. Anahita was, therefore, more completely identified in Armenia with the Mylitta of Western Asia than in the Ecbatana situate in Northern Media; but as to Mitra or Anahita, in Persia Proper, having been turned into Mylitta or Astarte, that is expressed in the saga, to the effect that Zoroaster, supported by king Gustasp, founded in Bactria the worship of the cypress, or planted a miraculous cypress,[3] under which symbol Venus, or Mylitta, was worshipped by Assyrians, Syrians, Armenians, and Phœnicians.[4] In Cappadocia, also Pontus and Lydia, her worship was widely spread. At Zela, in Pontus, she had a host of female sacred ministrants. In Armenia there were two deities standing at her side, as altar-companions, whom Strabo calls Omanos and Amandatos.[5] These were the

[1] Beros. *ap. Clem. Al. Protrept.* p. 43.
[2] Agathangel. in the *Acta SS. Sept.* viii. p. 332, § 32.
[3] Authorities collected by Lajard, in the *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscr.* xx. 128.
[4] Lajard, *l.c.* p. 94. [5] Strabo, p. 512.

Persian Amschaspands, Bahman (Bohumano), the lord of animal life, and Amerctat (in Pehlvi, Amardat), the lord of the trees. The account of Herodotus that the Persians called the Urania or Mylitta, whose worship they were taught by Assyrians and Arabians, Mitra, is not founded on a confusion of her with the male Mithras, for the name, which signifies "affable, cheerful," might just as well be used of the goddess, who was identical with the Greek Aphrodite.

The Sacæan festival, celebrated in honour of this goddess, appears to have been adopted by Persians and other nations, who honoured Anaitis, from the Babylonians, to whose Mylitta-worship it belonged, and only at a later period it seems to have a supposed application to a victory gained by Cyrus over the Sacæ. In Babylon, during this feast, the servants assumed authority over their masters; in Persia, it had a more tragic form,—a criminal, condemned to death, was seated in royal array upon the king's throne. The excess of sensual enjoyment was allowed him, and he might even make use of the king's concubines, and do, in fact, whatever he chose; but at last he was stripped, scourged, and hanged.[1]

A war-goddess, Nanæa, is also probably of West Asiatic origin. No trace of her is to be found in the *Zend-avesta*. To the Greeks she appeared to be for the most part a counterpart of Athene.[2] Her temple was sometimes next to that of Anaitis. Her sanctuary in Pasargadæ must have been in great esteem, for Artaxerxes journeyed thither on purpose to receive the royal consecration from the hands of the Persian priests.[3]

III. Heathenism in Mesopotamia, Babylonia, and Assyria

Anahita, transformed into the Assyrio-Babylonish Mylitta, leads us into those countries that lie to the east and west of the Tigris, forming the connecting link between the

[1] See Windischmann, *ut supra*, comp. Lajard, *Recherches sur le Culte de Vénus*, pp. 184 sqq.

[2] Dio. Chrys. *Or.* iv. 1. 161.

[3] Plut. *Artax.* 3.

high tableland of Irân to the east, and the Syro-Phœnician states on the coast of the Mediterranean to the west. There, in prehistoric times, a great Cushite Cephenic kingdom had existed, of which mention occurred in the traditions of the Greeks, as well as of the Hebrews. By those Cushites Babylon, the old city of Bel, was built, and from thence they had drawn off to Ninive. To these the priestly caste of the Babylonian Magians belonged, intercourse between whom and the Egyptian priesthood seems to have taken place at an earlier date, consisting in an exchange of cosmogonical ideas and astronomical experiences. When the Cushites of Central Asia were subdued by the Semites, the victors imparted their language, the Aramaic, to the vanquished, which thenceforward became the prevailing one in Assyria and Babylonia, so far as that the Persian kings continued to use it in their western provinces as the official one: but the religious ideas and gods of the Cushites passed into the keeping of the Semites, and the monotheistic cultus of El was degraded into the worship of Baal and Mylitta.

At this point the Chaldeans, first mentioned by Herodotus,[1] appear as the ruling priestly race, and the mainstay of all the higher science that is associated with religion. Were these Chaldeans in Babylon never anything else but a priest caste, and had they really, according to the statement of Diodorus, a part of them immigrated from Egypt, so that the old Cushite Magians were already called Chaldeans, or Kasdim? Or were they descendants of a people with the same name, dwelling in the mountains to the north of Mesopotamia, where the Koords do now, and did they come as conquerors into Babylon? Were they connected with the Chaldean people whom Strabo mentions as inhabiting the south-eastern part of Mesopotamia? These are difficult questions to answer. In Strabo's time the priest Chaldeans dwelt in a quarter of the city of Babylon by themselves, cut off from intercourse with others, and divided amongst themselves into tribes or families; they lived, besides, in Orche and Borsippos, and were split into particular classes or sects. In any case, the old Cushite Cephenic priesthood in existence in Babylonia

[1] Jer. xxxix. 3, 13; Diog. Laert. viii. 3; Curt. v. 1. 22.

as well as in Media, was perpetuated among the Chaldeans, or had passed over to them.

Babylon was the real birthplace and ancient metropolis of heathendom and of the worship of idols. Here stood the temple of Bel, still stupendous in its ruins, rising, in eight graduated storeys of pyramidal form, to the height of six hundred feet, though partially destroyed already in Alexander's time. At an earlier date, on the highest storey there was a golden altar and a beautiful couch, ready prepared for the god; and at times a woman from the country passed the night here, whom the god had selected himself, as the priests gave out. Before the golden image of Bel, on the lowest storey, stood a golden altar, on which, at the festival of the god, one thousand pounds of incense were consumed, at an enormous expense. In a worship such as this Babylonian one, in which the moral sense of guilt and repentance had retired into the background, vegetable offerings, particularly incense, naturally preponderated, and were offered in the immediate presence of the deity as the most acceptable, while the beasts offered were only slain in the court. Hence it is that in so many passages of the Old Testament, to "offer incense" is used absolutely, instead of "sacrificing to," or "worshipping" the gods,[1] and the Babylonians are certainly intended when Isaiah speaks of a people offering incense on every square of brick.[2]

Bel and Mylitta, who seem to be the Zeus and Rhea of the Greeks, were the supreme gods of Babylon. The latter was identical with the Syrian Astarte, the queen of heaven, and the Urania of Herodotus. Here, too, she appears as the great mother of life, the goddess of birth-labour, and protectress of propagation. Every woman in the land was her servant in the prostitution of herself to strangers. The Babylonian women sat within the precinct of the goddess with a garland wound like a cord round their heads; no one was to go home till a stranger had thrown a piece of money into her lap and challenged her to follow him in the name of the goddess Mylitta, nor could she ever refuse him: but, once consecrated by his embraces to the goddess, then, as Herodotus observes, no inducement, however great,

[1] 2 Kings xxii. 17, xxiii. 5; Jer. i. 16, vii. 9, xi. 13. [2] Isa. lxv. 3.

could obtain her favours again. This custom was in existence centuries before Herodotus: "the women," it is said in the letter of Jeremiah, "sit in the way, girded with cords and burning their magic perfumes; and if any one pass by and take one of them away for unchaste love, she glorifies herself to her neighbour that the other was not worthy, as she, that her girdle should be unloosed."[1] And this same custom still existed in Strabo's time.

Bel in Babylon was not essentially different from the Phœnician Bel; but in earlier times he was no sun-god; there was even on the spot a special image of the sun along with the other statues of the gods. He appears to have been a god of the heaven, of the light, and the fire; while Mylitta, like Anaitis, represented the defiled element of water. Only at a later period is Bel also designated as the Assyrian sun-god, who, however, at the same time resembles Saturn.[2] Without doubt Babylon had a sun god of its own, corresponding to the Assyrian Heracles-Sandon, or identical with him, but who does not appear to have been set up in the temple of Bel.

In other respects the cultus of the Chaldeans was predominantly one of astrolatry. The Belus temple served them as an observatory. They had shaped astronomy and astrology into a science in the closest relations with religion, and with them the two were based upon the hypothesis of a reciprocal action of, and sympathy between, the earth and the lights of the firmament. In those parts where, from the greater purity of sky and transparency of atmosphere, the heavenly bodies seem to be closer to man, and their brightness with its dazzling and bewitching influence fascinates those who plunge into their contemplation,—what could be so obvious, when once the heathen deification of nature had taken possession of their intellects, as to discern in the stars heavenly powers, revolving in their courses with will and consciousness of their own, and then to invoke them? How seductive this worship was is shown in the warning words of the Lawgiver of Israel, "That thou lift not up thine eyes to heaven, and gaze not on the sun and the moon, and the stars—the whole host of heaven—and pray to them and serve them."[3] "Have I looked upon

[1] Baruch vi. 42, 43. [2] Serv. *ad Æn.* i. 729. [3] Deut. iv. 15–19.

the light (the sun)," said Job, "and the moon when she walks forth in her beauty? Has my heart suffered itself to go astray secretly, to do homage to them as godlike rulers, so much as to kiss hands to them? That is evil-doing, for thereby I had denied God in the highest."[1]

Man soon now came to this, to ask the stars for counsel, to read in their motions the destinies of individuals and whole peoples, and to offer prayer and sacrifice to them, as powers of fate and living beings. There arose at the same time a desire to bring these powers, or at least the emanations of their power, nearer to them, to draw them down to themselves, and to detain them in immediate proximity. They carried about with them, as means of protection, the power of the stars that had streamed from them, or had been dexterously enticed from them, and concentred in amulets, or teraphim. All the craft of astrology and magic had an extensive theatre opened out for it. To the planets in particular, which they had early learned to distinguish from the fixed stars, with emblems assigned to them, the Chaldeans ascribed virtues which proceeded from them to dominate the entire circle of earthly creation, and exercise a determining influence upon the life of the earth and the beings pertaining to it. They styled the planets "interpreters," because by their peculiar revolution they indicated the future, and by their colour, and their rising and setting, declared the will of fate to those who were initiated in their mysteries. Each province of life under the moon was conceived as subordinated to one of the starry powers. In metals, stones, plants, beasts, and men, the virtue of the stars was revealed, and with that virtue their whole nature was penetrated: on this, then, hung their belief in astrological amulets, in which the power of some star was fancied to be concentrated and included, and which were worn as a defence against danger. Hence the destinies of countries and people, kings and private persons, could be read in the revolutions of the planets. In particular, the five planets, or their genii, were worshipped as gods, Jupiter and Venus as beneficent, Mars and Saturn as inimical; all, of course, under different names. Thirty other stars, subordinate to

[1] Job xxxi. 26–28.

the planets, were called "the counselling gods," and to them were added twelve more, "masters of the gods," to each of whom were assigned a month of the year, and one of the signs of the zodiac. It is not known whether the Assyrio-Babylonish deities, Nisroch, Anamelech, and Adramelech of the Bible, belonged to these star-gods or not.

According to Diodorus, who seems in the passage to be drawing from Ctesias, the Chaldeans maintained the world to be in its nature eternal—it had no beginning and would have no end; while the ordering of the whole is derived from a divine providence, and all that is now to be seen in the heaven is not contingent nor of itself, but arranged by a firmly established decree of the gods.[1]

Assyria received the worship of stars from Babylon, and that of Adonis from Syria. The old patron-goddess of the Assyrian empire, to whom all great works were referred, was Semiramis, originally the fish-goddess, Derceto or Atergatis; by degrees she was converted into the Syrian Urania, at the same time of kin to Mylitta, a metamorphosis thus expressed by the myth, that she was the daughter of Derceto, and that when she was born the mother threw herself into the water; but Semiramis had forbidden honour to be paid to any other gods but her. She was then represented as walking upon Derceto. Her attribute was the dove, held holy by the Assyrians, the symbol of wantonness and fruitfulness. In the ruins of Assyrian palaces the names of the gods Bel, Astarte, Beltis, and Assarak have been found, the last described as "great god" and "king of gods" in the inscriptions, and probably identical with Bel. The image of a god with an eagle's head, frequently met with there, represented, it is conjectured, the god Nisroch.[2] Uncouth human figures with wings and birds' claws, a woman's breast, and the tail of a scorpion, found delineated in an earth-heap of a palace at Nimrud, appear to represent an evil principle.[3] If one considers that the Assyrian civilisation was the result of a fusion of Chamites or Kushites with Semites and Arians on the Tigris, the appearance of such creatures is easily explained.

[1] Diod. ii. 29. [2] Isa. xxxvii. 38.
[3] Grotefend, in the *Abhandl. der Götting. Ges.* v. 141.

IV. Syria, Phœnicia, and Arabia

The old native religions in Syria were less affected by Greek colonisation and dominion than those of Asia Minor. Along with the Hellenic language, the Hellenic gods had also, it is true, been introduced into their cities in the country which had begun to flourish there in numbers, after the power of the Diadochi (Alexander's successors) was established; but on the old inhabitants of the land, the Canaanite races, this cultus exercised no particular attraction: they kept their antique gods and rites. Here we meet again with the name of a god which had as extensive a significance for the races dwelling between the Tigris and Mediterranean as ever the name of Zeus among the Greeks. These, while comparing him with their own gods, saw in him sometimes their Zeus, sometimes too Cronos or Helios, Heracles or Ares, or, in a Euhemeristic point of view, held him to be an old king deified. In earlier times Baal had been worshipped without an image in Tyre and its colonies; but for a long time now his worship had grown into an idolatry of the most wanton character, directed by a numerous priesthood, who had their headquarters in Tyre. A notion of the vast number of the priests of Baal is given by the fact that in the small kingdom of Israel alone there were four hundred and fifty priests of the god, besides four hundred of Aschera.[1] His statue rode upon bulls, for the bull was the symbol of the male power of generation, and he was also represented with bunches of grapes and pomegranates in his hands. As the people of Asia distinguished, properly speaking, only two deities of nature, a male generative and a female conceptive one, so Baal was of an elemental and sidereal nature at once. As the former, he was god of the creative power, bringing all things to life everywhere, and, in particular, god of fire: but he was sun-god besides, and, as such, to human lineaments he added the crown of rays about the head peculiar to this god. In the one quality as well as the other he was represented at the same time as sovereign of the heavens (Beelsamen), and of the earth by

[1] 1 Kings xviii. 19.

him impregnated. Accordingly, the Baal worshipped in the Syrian cities of Heliopolis, Emesa, and Palmyra, appeared to the Greeks to be their Helios; and on an inscription at Palmyra he is actually styled Baal-Schemesch, Lord of the Sun. By Euhemeristic interpretation, he appeared as the oldest king of all the states and people who worshipped him,—Assyrians, Babylonians, Phœnicians, Cyprians, Carthaginians, and Lydians; and as Zeus had his sepulchre in Crete, so there was also a sepulchre, or bones of Belus, remaining in Babylon, Tyre, and the Phœnician colony of Gades.

The Canaanitish Moloch (king) was not essentially different from Baal; but the same god in his terrible and destroying aspect, the god of consuming fire, the burning sun, who smites the land with unfruitfulness and pestilence, dries up the springs, and begets poisonous winds. When the prophet says, "Such as in the valley of Benhinnom built high places of Baal, to lead their sons and daughters through the fire to Moloch"; and again, "The Jews had built high places to Baal, to burn their children by fire as a burnt-offering to Baal,"[1]—there is no mistaking the essential identity of the two. Besides the incense consumed in his honour, bulls also were sacrificed to Baal, and probably horses too: the Persians at least sacrificed the latter to their sun-god. But the principal sacrifice was children. This horrible custom was grounded in part on the notion that children were the dearest possession of their parents, and in part that, as pure and innocent beings, they were the offerings of atonement most certain to pacify the anger of the deity; and further, that the god of whose essence the generative power of nature was, had a just title to that which was sexually begotten of man, and to the surrender of their children's lives. The sacrifices were consumed by fire; the life given by the fire-god he should also take back again by the flames which destroy being. The Rabbinical description of the image of Moloch, that it was a human figure with a bull's head and outstretched arms, is confirmed by the account Diodorus gives of the Carthaginian Cronos, or Moloch.[2] The image of metal was made glowing hot by a fire kindled within it,

[1] Jer. xxxii. 35, xix. 5.

[2] Jarchi on *Jer.* vii. 31; Diod. xx. 14.

and the children, laid in its arms, rolled from thence into the fiery lap below. Voluntary offering on the part of the parents was essential to the success of the sacrifice: even the firstborn, nay the only child of the family, was given up. The parents stopped the cries of their children by fondling and kissing them, for the victim ought not to weep, and the sound of complaint was drowned in the din of flutes and kettle-drums.[1] Mothers, said Plutarch, stood by without tears or sobs; if they wept or sobbed they lost the honour of the act, and their children were sacrificed notwithstanding.[2] Such sacrifices took place either annually on an appointed day, or before great enterprises, or on the occasion of public calamities, to appease the wrath of the god. This primitive custom is traceable in the myth of Theseus and the Minotaur. The Cretan monster with human body and bull's head, to whom young men and maidens were sacrificed, was the Moloch who had come from Phœnicia; and the overcoming of him by Theseus was the destruction of the bloody rite. Thus, too, the rape of Europa into Crete from Phœnicia, through means of the bull, was a symbol of the colonisation of that island by Phœnicians. The bull on which Europa sat was the sun-god, and she herself the moon-goddess Astarte.

Another form of Baal was Melkarth, or "city king," tutelary god of the city of Tyre, whose worship was carried far and wide by the colonies proceeding thence to the shores of the Mediterranean. This protector and archegetes of Tyre was the Phœnician Heracles, god alike of sun and fire (whence a perpetual fire was kept up upon his altars), a race-king and hero-leader of the people's expeditions. From him have the Asiatic features of the contest with the lion, the self-immolation by fire on the pile, and others, passed over into the Greek saga of Heracles.[3]

In the Astarte of the Western Asiatics we recognise that great nature-goddess standing by Baal's side, regent

[1] Euseb. *de laud. Const.* xiii. 4; Diod. xx. 14; Lact. *Inst.* i. 21. 13; Clitarch. *ap. Schol. in Plat. Remp.* i. 14. 5; Minuc. *Oct.* 30.

[2] Plut. *de Superst.* 13.

[3] Nonn. *Dionys.* xl. 369 sqq.; Sil. Ital. iii. 29; Luc. *de Dea Syr.* 49; Eus. *de laud Const.* xiii.

of the stars,[1] queen of heaven,[2] and goddess of the moon,[3] the mother of life, and goddess of woman's fecundity. Under the name of Astarte she was guardian-goddess of Sidon, and not essentially distinct from the Baaltis of Byblus and Urania of Ascalon. The Greeks and Romans sometimes take her for Juno, as she was the supreme female-goddess of the Asiatics; sometimes for Aphrodite, on account of the worship of unchastity sacred to her; and again for Selene, for she was pictured as the goddess of the moon with horns (lunar crescents). That Aschera, whose idol of wood was once set up in the very temple of Jehovah at Jerusalem,[4] was one in principle with the goddess otherwise styled Astoreth in the Old Testament, the relation between the two seeming to be analogous to that of Baal and Moloch. The human sacrifice offered to this goddess consisted in the prostitution of women: the women submitted themselves to the visitors of the feast, in the temple of the goddess or the adjoining precinct. Hence the legend told of Astarte having prostituted herself in Tyre for ten years; and in many places women as well as maidens consecrated themselves for a length of time,[5] or on the festivals of the goddess, with a view of propitiating her, or earning her favour as hierodouloi of unchastity.[6]

This practice, so widely spread in the world of old, the delusion that no service more acceptable could be rendered a deity than that of unchastity, was deeply rooted in the Asiatic mind. Where the deity itself was in idea sexual, or where two deities in chief, one a male and the other a female, stood in juxtaposition, there the sexual relation appeared as founded upon the essence of the deity itself, and the instinct and its satisfaction as that in men which most corresponded with the deity. Thus lust itself became a service of the gods; and as the fundamental idea of sacrifice is that of the immediate or substitutive surrender of a man's self to the deity, so the woman could do the goddess no better service than by prostitution. Hence it was also the custom that a maiden before her marriage should prostitute herself once in a

[1] Herodian. ii. 5. 10.
[2] Jer. vii. 18.
[3] Luc. *de Dea Syr.* 4.
[4] 2 Kings xxi. 7, xxiii. 6.
[5] Epiph. *Opp.* xi. 107.
[6] Athenag. *Leg.* p. 27.

temple of the goddess; and this was the same in kind as the offering of the first-fruits of the field. In Byblos the older custom was afterwards changed into that of the women cutting off their hair on the Adonis festival to the honour of Baaltis; only those who refused to make this sacrifice were obliged to submit themselves to strangers, and the present which they received for so doing was turned into an offering to the goddess.[1]

In this way they went so far at last as to contemplate even the abominations of unnatural lust as a homage rendered to the deity, and to exalt it into a regular cultus. The worship of the goddess at Aphaca in Lebanon was specially notorious in this respect. The temple in a solitary situation was, as Eusebius tells us, "a place of evil-doing for such as chose to ruin their bodies in scandalous ways. The men are soft and effeminate—men no longer; the nobility of their sex they heed not; they honour the deity by beastly lust. Criminal intercourse with women, impurity, shameful and degrading deeds, were practised in the temple, where there was no custom and no law, and no honourable or decent human being to be found."[2] The reputation, however, of this place of worship was all the greater because every year there, in the presence of a vast congregation of men, the miracle was repeated of a ball of fire appearing on the height of the mountain, and falling into the sea in the vicinity of the temple; costly presents were then thrown after it, and only those sank which were agreeable to the goddess, even though the lightest.

It was this same solitary goddess of Nature who was honoured under the title of "the Syrian goddess" at Hierapolis, "the holy city," in Syria, where she had a most renowned and splendid temple. Her idol, as Lucian describes it, belonged to the later period of Hellenism there prevailing, and so represented a pantheistic deity, under Greek influences. For the Greeks had divided the female principle of nature into a number of single forms of gods, and hence they found traits of each one of their

[1] Strab. 755; Luc. *de Dea Syr.* 6; Cyrilli *Comm. in Esai.* iii. 11. 275, ed. Paris.

[2] Eus. *Vit. Const.* iii. 56.

goddesses in the one comprehensive deity of the Asiatics. Therefore, as highest goddess, or queen of heaven, she was accounted as Hera by them; yet they recognised in her something of Athene, Aphrodite, Selene, Rhea, Artemis, Nemesis, and the Moirai. In fact, she came nearest to the Phrygian Cybele. Sceptre and spindle in hand, she wore rays and a mural crown on her head, and the girdle too—an ornament otherwise only beseeming the Aphrodite Urania. Her golden statue rode next to that of Baal-Zeus, in a chariot drawn by lions; a precious stone, placed upon her head, illuminated the whole temple at night. She was considered as one with Atergatis or Derceto, who is honoured under the form of a fish on the coasts of the Philistines. The worship was offered to the two, Baal, and the goddess. The temple was so exceedingly rich, that Crassus spent several days in weighing all the gold and silver vessels and precious things it contained.[1] These gifts were the combined offerings of Arabia, Babylonia, Assyria, Phœnicia, Cilicia, and Cappadocia, and therefore of all the people of the Semitic tongue.[2] In the court of the temple there were sacred beasts in a tame state in great numbers, and also the pond with its holy fish. Priests and temple-ministers were present in such numbers that Lucian counted above three hundred employed in one sacrifice: besides these there were troops of flute-blowers, Galli, and women frenzied with inspiration. At the spring festival, called by some the "brand feast," by others that of torches, and which was attended by streams of visitors from every country, huge trees were burnt with the offerings suspended on them. Even children were sacrificed; they were put into a leathern bag and thrown the whole height of the temple to the bottom, with the shocking expression that they were calves and not children. In the fore-court stood two gigantic phalli. To the exciting din of drums, flutes, and inspired songs, the Galli cut themselves on the arms; and the effect of this act, and of the music accompanying it, was so strong upon mere spectators, that all their bodily and mental powers were thrown into a tumult of excitement; and they too, seized by the desire to

[1] Plin. *H. N.* v. 19; Strabo, 748; Macrob. *Sat.* i. 23.
[2] Luc. *de Dea. Syr.* 10: cf. 16.

lacerate themselves, deprived themselves of their manhood by means of potsherds lying ready for the purpose. Thereupon they ran with the mutilated member through the city, and received from the houses which they threw them into, a woman's gear. Not chastity but barrenness was intended by mutilation. In this the Galli only desired to be like their goddess. The relation of foul lust, which they thenceforward occupied towards women, was regarded as a holy thing, and was tolerated by husbands in their wives.

The initiated of the Syrian goddess also, like the priests of Cybele, poured over the provinces of the Roman empire in companies of strolling beggars. They wandered from place to place, taking with them a veiled image, or symbol of their goddess, and clad in women's apparel of many colours, and with their faces and eyes painted in female fashion; armed with swords and scourges, they threw themselves by a wild dance into bacchanalian ecstasy, in which their long hair was draggled through the mud. They bit their own arms, and then hacked themselves with their swords, or scourged themselves in penance for a sin supposed to have been committed against the goddess. In these scenes, got up to aid the collection of money, it was a trick they must have practised to cut themselves so adroitly as not to inflict any very serious wounds.[1]

The cultus of the sun-god Elagabal at Emesa in Syria was of a similar kind. There the sun was worshipped under the form of a round black stone running to a point. Here, too, the high-priest wore woman's attire and ornaments; and the emperor Heliogabalus, who filled this office and transferred the god to Rome, threw human phalli as the most acceptable offering he could think of into the temple of the god. Only the fear of the pain kept him from submitting himself to mutilation: still, as loyal servant of his god, he did the next best he could, by making himself as effeminate as possible.[2]

Adonis, or Thammuz, was principally worshipped at Byblos: he had no cultus in the real Phœnician and Sidonian cities, and in the colonies of the former, particularly where Melkarth-Hercules was honoured. The first

[1] Senec. *de Vita Beat.* 27; Lact. 121.
[2] Dio. Cass. lxxix. 11; Herodian. v. 3.

day of the Adonis feast was consecrated to sorrow; weeping women proclaimed the loss and disappearance of the god, in whose honour, and that of Astarte, they must either cut off their hair or prostitute themselves to strangers.[1] A solemn burial of the idol, which was gone through with all the ceremonies of a funeral, closed the day of grief. The day of pleasure and joy began when Adonis was found again, *i.e.* when his head, enclosed in an earthen vessel, or in a basket of papyrus, arrived from the sea, or when the earthen vessel, with a letter from the women of Alexandria, reached the coast by water, with a message to the effect that Adonis had been found by Aphrodite.[2]

A system of gods, combining both Asiatic and Hellenic, had been formed in the beautiful capital of Syria, Antioch on the Orontes, with its "half-barbaric"[3] population, *i.e.* of Greeks and Asiatics mixed. In the neighbouring seat of pleasure, Daphne, with its groves of cypress and laurel, rich in springs, where nature herself invited to a life of wanton enjoyment, Astarte and Apollo were worshipped; but their rite resembled that of Baal and Astarte. Daphne was noted throughout the whole of the ancient world, and the people of Daphne had become proverbial for their luxurious festivals, unbridled debauchery, and unnatural vices, which the kings of Syria and their subjects rivalled one another in displaying there to the glory of the god; and it continued so under the Roman rule. Even a Libanius confessed that the celebration of the feast consisted only in the perpetration of all that was impure and shameless, and the renunciation of every lingering spark of decency.[4] Then came the Adonis festival; and the wide city was filled on all sides with howling, lamentation, and woe.[5] On the feast Majuma, held to Dionysos and Aphrodite, the spectacle consisted of naked prostitutes swimming.[6]

On the coasts of the Philistines at Gaza, and in all their towns, Dagon was the chief deity, and his temple itself for ages the sacred centre of the Philistine con-

[1] Luc. *de Dea Syr.* c. 6. [2] Cyrill. Alex. *ad Esai.* xviii.
[3] The term is used by Apollonius of Tyana, Philostr. *V. A.* i. 16.
[4] Liban. *Opp.* xi. 456, 555, cxi. 333 [5] Amm. Marc. xxii. 10.
[6] Chrysost. *Hom.* vii. in Matth., *Opp.* vii. 113, ed. Bened.

federacy. His image had a human head and hands upon the body of a fish.[1] He resembled, then, the Babylonian god Odakon, mentioned by Berosus, whose image was, in like manner, half-fish and half-man. Next to him a kindred goddess, Derceto, was worshipped, whose principal seat was Ascalon; she too had a figure the lower half fish, the upper part representing a woman. The fish form, common to the two deities, indicated their being marine deities, and was somewhat of a peculiarity of the Philistine coast, distinguishing it from the rest of Syria. The myth that Derceto, deluded by her enemy Aphrodite, had given birth to a daughter, Semiramis, and had then for shame and grief thrown herself into a pool of water and been changed into a fish, shows that hostile relations existed between her cultus and that of Urania at Ascalon.

The god Marnas, to whom the people of Gaza clung with extreme tenacity till late in Christian times, was a Philistine weather-god corresponding to Baal and Zeus, who, it seems, thrust Dagon aside; and to him in preference all resorted in times of great drought and sterility.

Hardly anywhere did heathenism, favoured by the circumstances of a border territory lying between two hostile kingdoms, exhibit such a tough vitality as at Charræ, or Harran, in Mesopotamia. All through the Christian times till deep into the middle ages, this city and its surrounding neighbourhood preserved its pagan traditions. These consisted of a mixture of Greek ideas with the worship of the old Syrian gods; hence the town was also called Hellenopolis and the City of the Heathen. An Hellenic school, with traditions of the Neo-Platonists, long existed here; and as late as the year 540 A.D. the Persian king Chosru spared Harran by way of recompense for the greater part of the inhabitants having remained steadfast in heathenism.[2] The cultus of an androgynic moon-deity had earned so high a reputation for the place that even emperors like Caracalla and Julian were attracted thither. When the Khalif Mamun, in the year 830, threatened with death these people of Harran, who also dwelt in Edessa

[1] 1 Sam. v. 3–5.

[2] Procop. *Bell. Pers.* ii. 13: cf. "Notes of Sa. Martin to Le Beau," *Hist. du Bas. Emp.* iii. 61.

and some other cities of north-eastern Syria and Mesopotamia, if they would not confess to belonging to any one of the tolerated religions, they determined then to give themselves out as Sabians, under which denomination the Koran understood the Babylonian ancestors of the Mendaïtes of the present day.[1] Since then the Mahumedans have given the heathen of Harran the title of Sabians, while the Syrian Christians have called them throughout Harranians or Rhenfoio, *i.e.* heathens. Their chief god was a sun-god called Schemal, "the great lord," after whom came the deity of the moon and the seven planet-gods, partly male and partly female. To Beltis or Mylitta they offered holocausts of living beasts. Thammuz or Adonis always continued to be made lamentation for by the women, but was given out for a prophet who had been murdered by a king for exhorting him to the worship of the planet-gods and of the signs of the Zodiac. Part of the secret rite consisted of the sacrifice of a new-born child, the flesh of which, after it had been put to death, was soft-boiled, and then mixed with meal and different vegetables. In this state it was made into cakes, which served the initiated, to the exclusion of all women, the year through, as a kind of infernal communion. Here we discover the fountain from which flowed an exactly similar custom of certain Gnostic sects; and, moreover, an explanation is gained of the well-known charge of renewing the banquet of Thyestes, generally brought against the early Christians by the heathen of the Roman empire.[2]

The numerous Arabian races had a quantity of gods and rites, nearly all of which were of the sidereal kind, and therefore reducible in reality to a few astral deities upon a closer inspection. Abul-Faradsch names five constellations, with sun and moon, Aldabaran, Jupiter, Canopus, Sirius, and Mercury, as objects of adoration among individual tribes. In the town of Taif, lying to the south-east of Mecca, "the great goddess Allat" was worshipped under

[1] Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* ed. ii. p. 252, from the *Fihrist*: cf. the "Communications" from Chwohlsohn's unpublished work upon the Sabians, in the *Bulletin Hist. Phil. de l'Acad. de Petersb.* x. 226 sqq.

[2] See the passages in Hottinger, *l.c.* p. 273, with the amendment of Abrah. Echellens, *Eutych. Vindic.* ii. 336. Chwohlsohn has established this from manuscripts.

the form of a square white stone by the tribe of the Takif. The Coreishites served the same goddess beneath a large sacred palm-tree, to which they made a yearly pilgrimage to suspend their arms upon it and slay victims.[1] A palm-tree of the kind was also invoked in the city of Nagran: every year a feast was held in its honour, during which people hung votive offerings of cloth-stuff and women's dress upon it.[2] The goddess Allat is the Alilat whom Herodotus compares to Urania and Mylitta, but who appears to have been principally a goddess of the moon among the Arabians.

The Koran speaks of two more chief goddesses besides Allat, Uzza, and Manat. Uzza, or the "high puissant,"[3] was invoked by the tribe of the Gatafan, under the form of a Samurah tree, a species of acacia; among other tribes her image was that of a woman; Evagrius styles her Aphrodite.[4] The poet Zaid Ben-Aner makes mention of two daughters of Uzza.[5] The goddess Manat was worshipped chiefly at Jathreb (Medina); to other tribes a block of stone served as her idol.

In Arabia Petræa, at Bostra, Petra, and Sela, Dusares was honoured as highest god, the Urotal whom Herodotus identifies with Dionysos. His image was to be met with at Petra, in a rich temple, with adornments of gold, but was, itself, only a coarse square misshapen black stone, upon a golden pedestal. It was only as god of the sun that he was made into a Dionysos, though after his cultus had been extended as far as Italy, his name is to be found on the Roman coins with the emblems of vintage.[6] This god had human sacrifices offered to him. The Scenite Arabians, or Dumateni, annually sacrificed a boy to him, whom they afterwards buried under the black stone;[7] and, as late as the time of the emperor Maurice, an Arab sheikh

[1] Osiander, "Studien über die Vorislam. Rel. d. Arab." in the *Zeitsch. d. D. M. Ges.* vii. 481.

[2] Caussin de Perceval, *Essai sur l'Hist. des Arabes*, i. 125.

[3] Bergmann, *de Relig. Arab. ante Islam.* (Strasburg, 1834), p. 10.

[4] *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 22.

[5] *Ap. Reiske, Primæ Lineæ*, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 265.

[6] Zoega, *de Obelisc.* pp. 205, 206.

[7] Porphyr. *de Abst.* ii. p. 225; Euseb. *Præp. Evg.* iv. 16; *Or. ad Const.* c. 13.

was converted to Christianity who had sacrificed a number of such victims with his own hand.[1]

In the great national sanctuary at Mecca, in the Caaba, founded about the beginning of the first century before Christ, three hundred and sixty idols of all the Arabian tribes were set up. The principal deity of the temple and of the Coreishites was Hubal, who was represented holding seven arrows in his hand, and lots were drawn before him with arrows.[2] This worship was of northern introduction hither, from Syria, and Hubal is manifestly identical with the god of the Harranians. In a general way idols of human shape must have first come hither from Syria, as the Arabs assert. The earlier and cherished objects of an Arab's devotion were stones and trees, in which, as also in idols shaped like men, they saw and adorned not mere symbols of deity, but instruments and channels of divine power and operation. Schahrastani calls the Sabians, or Star-worshippers, the followers of "the housing creed," because they viewed the planets as mansions of their gods: "but," he makes them say, "these houses are visible for a time, and at another time are not so; therefore we must have figures and personal forms ever before our eyes, that we may have recourse to them, and through them win an entrance into the habitations; we invoke them, therefore, in order that they may bring us quite close to the deity."[3] And then, he also says, in the preparation of images, time, day, and hours, and all the astronomical relations of favourable "conjunction," have to be watched. The Arab custom of smearing their idols with the blood of animal victims, or of pouring the blood over their heads, appears to be connected with this notion of their power.[4]

A vast number of temples were to be found in single cities: Sabotha in Hadramant had sixty; Thomna, a town of the Gebanites, sixty-five.[5] This must have arisen from the images of the gods of various small tribes being there united, as afterwards in the Caaba at Mecca. The last, as a kind of Arabian metropolis, the estimation of which is at the same time confirmatory of the precedence

[1] Evagr. *H. E.* vi. 22. [2] Pococke, *Spec. Hist. Arab.* ed. White, p. 98.
[3] *Religionspartheien*, transl. by Haarbrücker, ii. 68.
[4] Rasmussen, *Additamenta*, p. 69. [5] Plin. *H. N.* xii. 32.

of the Coreishites over the other tribes, seems gradually to have assumed a very exclusive character, so that when the Nakissites built themselves a sanctuary similar to the Caaba, Irheir made it a pretext for proclaiming war against them and destroying their temple.[1] On the same ground, Abraha, king of Yemen, made an expedition with an army against the Caaba, to destroy it utterly; but the sanctuary, it was thought, escaped by a miracle.[2]

V. Egypt

1. SYSTEM OF GODS

The assertion has been lately repeated, that the Egyptians were the most religious of all the pagan nations of antiquity; and this is correct so far as the fact goes that no other people so thoroughly and willingly submitted themselves to the sovereignty of their religion and the galling yoke of its practice, entering as it did into every relation of their lives. Their religious feelings were warmer, and at the same time more tenacious and passionate, than those of the Greeks and Romans. Every innovation in matters of religion was resolutely declined: they kept an obstinate hold upon their traditionary gods and rites; and, under the superintendence of an uncommonly numerous and strongly organised priesthood, thousands of years passed away without the peculiar character of their religion receiving any essential alteration, or even so much as development.

The Egyptians were not, like the Greeks, a political, creative, and myth-composing nation. The dearth of their imaginative powers, the uniform and exclusive character of their country and the natural scenery about them, and the early organisation of their colleges of priests, admitted of no mythological development: their gods are wanting in the multiplicity and plastic personality of the Greek world of deities, and but a few ideas were embodied in them. But they have at the same time far less of human form and passion than the Greek: it is only in the Osiris saga that the more regular form of a myth is taken, and

[1] Abulfed. *Hist. ante. Isl.* p. 136; Pococke, p. 93. [2] Abulf. p. 200.

that saga would not have developed itself in this way but for the influence of strangers and the religious conflicts arising therefrom.

At first sight the number of deities seems to be rather considerable. Three cycles, or dynasties, of gods are mentioned; for, like other people, the Egyptians set a successive reign of gods at the beginning of their history. The first dynasty consisted of the seven supreme deities with Ra, the national god of the sun, at their head, and to these the Osiris family was annexed. Then followed a second dynasty of twelve gods, and a third of thirty semi-gods. Now, as a fixed period of government is here attributed to each individual god, and as Herodotus also makes his cycle of gods follow one upon another in order of time, and announces it as the common idea that each several god had ruled a determinate period over men; the whole of this partition and chronological succession is without a doubt an artificial production of the priests, at a time when the Egyptians were united into one kingdom. Still, this further truth lies at the root of the matter, that the prevalence of one god, and of his cultus, varied with the times, and received its direction according to the importance of the city in which the worship of the god was originally domesticated.

The Egyptian religious system is clearly the product of different local worships. In proportion with the political combinations of the various territorial divisions into larger governments, those of Upper and Lower Egypt, the deities also worshipped in the smaller divisions were thrown together into a whole, and so cycles of gods were formed, three of which were afterwards enumerated. The formation of these cycles and the determination of rank amongst the gods were regulated by the frequently changing political influences of individual cities. Already in each province the capital city formed also the religious centre; and as Egypt assumed the shape of a double kingdom, the mythologies and worships of the two places of royal residence, Memphis in Lower, and Thebes in Upper Egypt, obtained the first rank, their doctrines and rites being independently developed by the colleges of priests on the spot. Thus there grew up a very artificial polytheism,

while in old times each city, or department, had worshipped one god, or at least only one chief god, generally, with one goddess, as an assessor, or mate, expressing his essence in its female aspect. Still, each particular city and nome persevered in the worship of its own special god; Set, for instance, continued to be the god of Ombos, Horus of Edfu, Chem of Coptos, Leto goddess of Buto, Thoth the lord of Hermopolis, and Chnuphis that of the country of Esneh. When Thebes and her dynasty acquired the sovereignty of the newly formed kingdom, Ammon, the local god there, became the "king of gods": as, by the exaltation of Memphis, her local god Phthah (Hephæstos) stepped into the first place.

The worship of the sun formed the basis of the Egyptian system. The first group, as well in the cycle of the gods of Upper Egypt as in those of Memphis, was composed only of sun-gods. The one Creator and God of the oldest tradition had, through the Chamites of the Nile valley, entered in a double fashion into the mytho-theogonic process: first, in the attribution of sex and distinction made of the male and female aspect; and next by materialising and identifying with the sun, as the mightiest power of nature ruling over the earth.

There now came prominently out before all, as the oldest and most universal, a god who does not seem, like the rest, to have belonged to any special locality—Ra, the king and father of the gods; in relation to whom the others were but as copies, or only received a higher and more general importance by being first identified with him. He alone had no goddess by him. If made the head of a triad in the way which the priests preferred, a female goddess, Ra, would merely be set at the side of the male god Ra, with the feminine termination affixed to his name.[1] He, too, "the lord of the two worlds, enthroned in the sun's disk," had, indeed, his principal seat of old at Heliopolis (On), the city of the sun, so called after him; but this city never acquired any political importance in Egypt, like Memphis or Thebes, and the high and wide-spread renown of Ra is not to be ascribed to a pro-

[1] Lepsius on the "First Cycle of Egyptian Gods," in the *Berl. Akad. Abh.* 1851, p. 193.

pagandism of his worship from thence. On the contrary, Ra retains his character as supreme creating god on the monuments in all parts of Egypt.[1] He is the "god of the two zones, who begets himself,"—the standing primal type of the old kings of the soil, who derived their earthly power immediately from him.

Thus Ra had a mother, Neith; but she did not conceive him of a male divine being. He himself gave birth to himself, or, as the sun, does so daily, as is said in one of the hymns; or, he is "the only generator in heaven and on earth, not being himself generated."[2] "It is he," says another hymn, "who is in the beginning." "The gods of the celestial abodes have not given birth to their own members themselves, it is thou who hast given birth to them one and all." But as the idea of the supreme creator-god was, from the very earliest times, coincident to an Egyptian's mind with that of the sun-god, so the god might have a mother, who was, therefore, the heaven, in particular the nocturnal heaven, or heaven still conceived of without sun. "Thy mother, the heaven, stretches out her arms after thee," is an expression of a hymn upon the tomb of the priest Ptahmes, or, "Thou shinest, father of the gods, upon thy mother's back; daily thy mother receives thee in her arms: when thou shinest in the dwelling of the night, thou unitest thee with thy mother, the heaven." The daily rising of the sun, therefore, was counted the image of the eternal and divine generation of Ra.

The far-famed inscription of the goddess Neith at Sais ran thus:[3] "I am what is, what is to be: no one has lifted up my garment: the fruit I have borne, has become the sun." Here is the expression of the material Pantheism, penetrating and dominating the whole religious system of the Egyptians, which has clouded over the older idea of a living creator-god. The heaven, or the primal night, is the Hyle, the passive female principle, the primitive matter, which of itself is incapable of creating, yet bears in its bosom the male and generative principle. God, self-generating, that is, separating himself from the maternal

[1] De Rougé in the *Revue Archéol.* viii. 55. [2] *Id. l.c.* 54.

[3] According to Proclus (*Comm. in Tim.* i. 30), whose text here is sounder than in Plutarch.

womb of matter, is gone forth as the sun, from whom now all life and form in nature have proceeded.

With this too we find the notion, so strongly prominent in the Egyptian religious teaching, that the god is not only the son of the female deity attached to him, but is also her consort, who again, along with his mother, begets a son, completing the triad. In this way the Arsaphes or ithyphallic Ammon at Thebes, the Manduli of Calabsche, Hor-Hat at Tentyra, and others, are the husbands of their mothers.[1] This is the Egyptian way of viewing the world and the gods: from the aboriginal Hyle, the chaos of the Greeks, a principle arises, a first, conscious, all-mighty power. This still hidden god, the unrevealed, creates himself a body, the sun, and so becomes the revealed god, who again forms from matter a second divine being (or from his mother begets a son). This view it was which led to the assumption of hermaphrodite deities, namely, when the first and supreme being (still antecedently to the distinction of the two sexes, or potentiæ, in him, the passive conceiving, and the active generating) was imagined as a unity still including both in itself. Such double-natured beings were Neith and Phthah;[2] both of whom, however, appear again as purely sexual beings, the one female, and the other male.

In Upper Egypt the oldest gods were Mentu and Atmu, of the same signification as Ra, and therefore sun-gods; the one representing the rising sun of the upper world, the other the setting sun of the under world. Mu was son of Mentu, or of Atmu also, and he too is called the son of Ra, and his companion Tefnet, the "daughter of the sun." Since the twelfth dynasty, the god Ammon first rose into greater esteem at the exaltation of Thebes, where his cultus flourished. From his association with Ra, he became the sun-god and king of the gods, and, according to the Greek view, corresponded to Zeus. Out of, and prior to, this combination, and elsewhere than at Thebes he appears in paintings and sculptures as sacrificing to Osiris.[3] Yet the old Theban sun-gods, Mentu and Atmu,

[1] Le Normant, *Musée des Antiquités égypt.* p. 65.

[2] Athene and Hephæstos, Horapollo says, i. 12, p. 19, ed. Leemans.

[3] Wilkinson, 2nd Ser. i. 245.

kept their ground even during the period when the worship of Ammon was at its highest: then Ammon-Ra ranked before Mentu: recourse seems to have been had to the division into morning, midday, and evening sun. With Mut and Khonso, Ammon formed the great triad in Thebes, and the horned serpent was sacred to him. In his temple slept a priestess, who was to have intercourse with no man, like the woman who, as the bride of the god, slept in the uppermost storey of the Belus temple at Babylon.[1] The god Neph, Cneph, or Chnubis, was a form of the god Ammon of later origin. He was worshipped in the Thebaïs generally, Plutarch tells us, as a man with a ram's head, with a serpent or a vase on his head, and afterwards with four rams' heads. As Neph-Ra he was also converted into a sun-god, and was generally on an equal footing with the highest gods, who were all only varied personifications of the same idea of god. He was, therefore, also the author of gods and men, and represented as making man in a potter's wheel, or oven.[2] The notion of him as the divine spirit of life, or world-soul, seems to belong to the period shortly before or after Christ. The Greeks called him the Zeus of Ethiopia, and in late inscriptions he is called Jupiter-Ammon-Chnubis.[3] For he came to be so frequently interchanged with Ammon, that people thought they recognised Ammon again in the ram-headed god: and in fact the two gods, or forms of gods, also bordered geographically on one another, Cneph was principal god in the southern parts of the Thebaïs, in Elephantine and Syene, but Ammon in the northern and in Thebes itself.

At Memphis, the capital of Lower Egypt, Phthah, taken by the Greeks to be Hephæstos, was the leading god. For the high importance he attained afterwards (Manetho ranked him at the head of the whole array of gods), he appears to have been indebted to the position of the city of Memphis. He was designated upon the monuments as father of the gods, and, in particular, of Ra, the sun, and as such the ancients are acquainted with him.[4] Yet there is also dis-

[1] Herod. ii. 54, 58.
[2] Vaux, *Handbook to the Antiquities of the British Museum*, 1851, p. 353.
[3] Letronne, *Recueil des Inscr.* i. 396. [4] Cic. *N. D.* 321.

coverable an "eldest Phthah-Child," called Inhotep.[1] The name of Phthah himself is the first created, *i.e.* who has given himself individual existence without having a father; and hence he too, as primal being, was double-sexed, like Neith. He is further styled the "lord of truth," the "beneficent god"; he dwells in the golden house, and carries the Nilometer, the symbol of constancy, in his hand. The well-known beetle, the scarabæus, the representations of which occur without end, was particularly sacred to him; this creature having made a ball of dung and turning towards the east, rolls it from east to west, and then scratches in the ground for twenty-eight days; besides, its thirty legs indicate the number of the days of the month.[2] In Philæ, Hephæstos was delineated as god the Demiurge, it being he who always formed the world-egg,[3] and in inscriptions he is constantly called Phthas, who rolls his egg, the sun, in the heavens. He, therefore, appears by the predicates assigned him, not as actual sun-god, like Ra, but is rather the first being, preceding the sun, the first generative power conceived of as the primal fire. That he had this signification is further probable from the title given his female aspect, the lion-headed goddess Pascht, who was styled at Philæ "the great mistress of fire in Senem, the living flame-consuming goddess."[4]

In a verse of Cratinus there is an Egyptian god, Socharis, mentioned, who is presented on the monuments only in the company of Phthah, or with Osiris, as Phthah-Sokari, or Sokari-Osiris, or combining the two into one deity, as Phthah-Sokari-Osiris. It was none other than he who in his dwarfish image, resembling the Phœnician Patæci, excited the ridicule of Cambyses at Memphis; he was frequently figured with the head of a hawk, and the scarabæus upon it. Phthah-Sokari also frequently stands on two crocodiles, which are meant to be emblems of time and darkness.[5] The procession in which his sacred boat was carried about was one of the grandest solemnities.[6]

[1] Brugsch, *Reiseberichte*, p. 193.
[2] Horapollo, i. 10; Plut. *Isid.* 34; Plin. *H. N.* xxx. 11.
[3] Rosellini, *Monum. del Cullo*, pl. 21.
[4] Brugsch, *Reiseber.* p. 263.
[5] *Monumens égypt. du Musée de Leide*, ii. 8.
[6] Wilkinson, 2nd Ser. i. 254.

Here again there is evidence of the internal connection of the Egyptian first-class deities one with the other, and of the difficulty, or rather the impossibility, of grasping their independent individuality, not only in idea, but even in actual life and cultus. Osiris was, in principle, only the earthly manifestation of Phthah, who had brought himself close to man in him, and subjected himself to the conditions of humanity. On this account too the bull Apis is called, in the inscriptions of the Serapeum, the Phthah, who returns to life, or rises again, while, on the other side, the priests positively asserted the soul of Osiris dwelt in his body.[1]

The city of Chemmis or Panopolis, in the Theban district, derived its name from the god Chem, who was worshipped there under the form of the ithyphallus, wherefore the Greeks compare him with their Pan. He was, in one aspect, only a repetition of Ammon, the generative, life-imparting sun: on the oldest monuments he is styled "Ammon, in his strength—Ammon, the husband of his mother." But Horus also appears under the designation of the "impregnator of his mother"; and in the Turin Book of the Dead, the departed, among other mystical matters, has an explanation to offer about Chem, consisting in this, that Chem-Horus was his father's avenger; and his coming forth, or appearance, which was the object of a special festival, was his birth, and that the feathers on his head signified Iris and Nephthys.[2] The god of Mendes in the Delta was distinct from Chem, and according to the account of Herodotus was represented quite as Pan, half man and half he-goat. As Diodorus tells us, many held Osiris to be identical with Pan, so the Mendesian god was an ithyphallic form of Osiris,[3] or Ammon-Ra, or rather the twain: and in fact he is found on a pillar at Turin with the inscription, "Mendes Ammon-Ra, consort of his mother, lord of the heavens"; and on another in the British Museum, with the designation of "the great Mendes with the two feathers, Horus."[4] He was also a god of the power of generation; and the he-goat, a wanton lustful animal, was worshipped there as a manifestation of him.

[1] Brugsch, *Reiseber.* 78; Plut. *Isid.* c. xx. 29.
[2] Birch, *Archæol.* xxxiv. 371.
[3] So Lepsius thinks, *Aeg. Götterkreis*, p. 175.
[4] Orcurti, ii. 40.

The Isis cultus had for its chief seat Philæ, or an island of the Nile; but the goddess herself was the most distinguished, and her worship the most general, in all Egypt. She is termed the goddess with ten thousand names, and actually was, or rather became a Proteus of ever-varying hues, and assuming the most manifold forms. The Greeks liken her to Athene, Demeter, Persephone, Tethys, and Selene;[1] to the Egyptians she was coincident with Hathor and Mut; but her attributes extended to Pascht and Nephthys also, and at times she appears herself with the cat's head, the characteristic of the goddess of Bubastis. She was represented with horns and disk or a crown on her head; also with a vulture-crest, holding a sceptre of flowers and the cross of life in her hand. She too was a cosmogonic goddess like the rest, the feminine passive Hyle inseparably connected with Osiris (the active, generative, plastic principle), the sister, consort, daughter, and mother of Osiris. The primeval city of This and its neighbour Abydos, in Upper Egypt, as well as the Memphis in Lower Egypt, founded from This, were the places of the cultus of Osiris and of Isis. There the oldest kingly dynasties ruled, and the worship of the two deities spread itself over the whole Nile valley.

Isis and Osiris, alone of the Egyptian gods, were subjects of a varied myth with a partial dressing of foreign and borrowed ornaments. The different mysteries celebrated in Egypt were all attached to this myth. Yet Isis, as the real supreme goddess of the whole land, stood higher in esteem than Osiris, though she was the female nature-power longing for the male impregnating principle, seeking it and mourning in its absence; and hence she showed herself to the Egyptians, now as their soil thirsting for quickening of water, and impregnated by the Nile; now as the earth shone upon and enlivened by the sun. Even in the sun's course they saw Isis seeking Osiris, though Osiris himself was originally the sun-god, and Ra became identified with him for that reason; but Isis, in relation to him, passed for goddess of the moon. Then, according to the account of Diodorus, probably drawn from Manetho,

[1] Plut. *de Is. et Osir.* ix. 27, 34, 52; Birch, *Gallery*, i. p. 32; Wilkins. 2nd Ser. i. 366.

the Egyptians originally worshipped but two gods, Helios and Selene, the one in Osiris, the other in Isis; and in Plutarch Osiris is son of Helios, and again Helios himself. It was only on account of his relations with the realm of the dead the Greeks turned him into a Dionysos.

The Isis and Osiris myth, as found in the Greek authorities, not indeed without Greek additions, runs in substance thus: Osiris, brother and husband of Isis, who was born with him of Chronos and Rhea (Seb and Mut), when he attained dominion, civilised the Egyptians, taught them the culture of the fields and of the grape, gave them law and the worship of the gods; then went the world over, and after his return, by a trick of Typhon, who had conspired against him with twelve accomplices and the Ethiopian king Aso, was shut up in a coffin. The searching and sorrowful Isis is now delineated exactly like Demeter, the stories running parallel word for word. At last she finds the coffin, that had been thrown into the sea, cast up on the shore at Byblos, and hides it; but Typhon comes at the moment and cuts up the body of Osiris into fourteen pieces and throws them away, but casts the private parts into the Nile, where they were devoured by fishes. Isis sought for and found the pieces and buried them; and thus there are so many graves of Osiris in Egypt, namely, fourteen; the missing member she caused to be represented by the phallus, and as such to receive divine honour. The mutilation of the corpse of Osiris is a feature plainly indebted for its origin to the existing number of the tombs of Osiris, and their pretensions to the possession of the real body. Osiris was now turned into the ruler of the realm of the dead, while Horus, the son of Isis and Osiris—in reality an Osiris rejuvenescent, or restored to life—becomes at once a hero of the myth. The goddess Buto, held by the Greeks to be Leto, who had a temple and oracle in the city of the same name, passes for the person who educated the young Horus. The murdered father appeared to the son, and encouraged him to avenge his death. Before the beginning of the struggle, Thucris, the concubine of Typhon, passed over to Horus. Typhon was conquered and given up in fetters to Isis, who, however, set him free; whereupon Horus, enraged with his mother, tore the crown

from her head. Hermes, or Thoth, replaced it with the head of a cow. The entire myth, the only circumstantial one the unimaginative Egyptians invented, not without help from the Hellenes, exercised for that reason a more powerful influence on the minds of the people; chiefly the two principal features of it, the sorrow of Isis and Nephthys over the loss of Osiris, and the contest of the gods who avenged Osiris with Set or Typhon, gave the colour to the whole religious year of the Egyptians, at one time of gloom, at another of cheerfulness and joy. How little the Egyptian cast of mind was adapted really to conceive the gods and their relation to men in the form of a myth, is most clearly shown by another myth preserved in Plutarch. When Rhea had secret intercourse with Chronos (Mut with Seb), Helios (Ra) laid the curse upon her that she should not bear a child neither in a month nor a year; but Hermes (Thoth), who was also an intimate of the goddess, won five days of the moon at draughts, on the third and fifth of which Typhon and Nephthys were born. The fable was palpably an invention of the priests, with the double aim of depreciating the two gods Set and Nephthys, as foreign and illegitimate deities, and smuggled in as by imposture; and also to refer the insertion of the five intercalary days to a divine act.

Osiris has always been reckoned along with the great and first gods; and it is only a mistake of Herodotus to enumerate him amongst the last gods, or those of the third cycle. The multiplicity of names by which the Greeks attempted to express the nature and essence of Osiris, show how little they were in a position to find a god in their Pantheon really corresponding to him. Those they chose do but fit him in one aspect or relation. They call him Helios, Dionysos, Hades, Pluto, Pan, Oceanos, Neilos, Zeus. The names of Epaphos or Ammon were more suitable; for the former was the son of Zeus and Io, born on the Nile, Io by her bovine form being closely assimilated to Isis; and there was a reason and a handle for making him identical with Ammon, as his designation, also appearing in the Book of the Dead, is that of Osiris-Ra, *i.e.* the sun-god like Ammon-Ra.

Osiris appears as god of the power of generation in the

festival of the Pamylia celebrated in his honour, which, putting the music out of the question, was quite like a Dionysic festival; only, instead of the phalli, painted puppets an ell long, with a member moved by strings and not much smaller than the whole body, were carried about by the women in procession, and at the same time a statue was set up furnished with triple organs of generation.[1] Osiris was also a god of the element of moisture, or every humid nourishing power issued from him, and all water was sacred to him; hence the Greeks make him into Oceanos, or again, the god of rain, Dionysos Hyes:[2] but above all, the Nile, with its unknown sources, was held to be poured forth from Osiris; in other words, Osiris was himself the Nile. It might suit a Greek to convert him into an Oceanos, but not a genuine Egyptian, for to him the sea was a thing corrupt, diseased, and inimical; hence the brine was called by them Typhon's foam: the priests did not use it, at least in sacrificing, and they never greeted a sailor.

Horus, or Har, was considered by the Greeks as an Egyptian Apollo, probably because he too was a serpent-killing god; he was frequently pictured as running a spear through the head of the serpent Apophis. Originally he was a local sun-god; in Upper Egypt he was called the Triple Horus, *i.e.* the lord of Scham, Bechai, and Bak. He also appears as Har, the lord of Bak;[3] and in Edfu, the great Apollo city of the Greeks, he had a famous temple as Hor-Hat, the great god, the lord of heaven, the golden sparrow-hawk, the son of Osiris, ruler of gods and goddesses.[4] His mother here was Hathor, and probably it was at a later period he was associated with her or Isis, and with Osiris; then, under another conception, he was (as Arueris) son of Ra and Nutpe, and elder brother of Osiris: he has also been made a son of Seb.

Identical with him was Harpocrates (Har-pe-chrot), or Horus the child, who was represented as an infant child,

[1] Herod. ii. 48; Plut. *Is.* c. xxxvi. Wilkinson (2nd Series, i. 342) is of opinion that the feast belonged to the god Chem; and Rosellini (*Monum. Civ.* iii. 80) will have it relates to the ithyphallic Ammon, as he is the only god so represented always on the monuments. Chem, Ammon, and Osiris were in principle one and the same being.

[2] Plut. *Isid.* c. 32.

[3] Birch in the *Archæol.* xxxiv. pp. 358, 359.

[4] Brugsch, *Reiseberichte*, p. 227.

with his finger on his mouth, the Greeks and Romans mistaking him for a god of silence, and moderns after them have interpreted him to be the symbol of the silent and mysterious agency of nature in generation. Harpocrates rather was a young sun-god, *i.e.* the morning sun. It is said of him in an inscription, "if his head appears in heaven, the world that was in darkness is illuminated." Though Harpocrates cannot be actually distinguished from Horus, and is only a form of him, yet the attempt was made in Egypt to keep asunder three beings, who nevertheless are always passing one into the other, namely, Harpocrates, the younger Horus, and the older. This last, Har-uer-Arueris, was represented as man with the head of a sparrow-hawk, and formed a triad with a goddess Tsenenofre and his son Pnebto; the younger, whom the Greeks thought one and the same with their Apollo, was called "the support and defender of his father Osiris." Meanwhile we are not to look for a sharp-cut individuality in these gods; they are always dissolving again and disappearing in the notion of the sun. The interpretations of the Greeks are arbitrary, fluctuating, and deceptive. It seems that Hor-Hat, with the hawk's head and the symbol of the winged ball, was one with the god whom the later Greeks termed Agathodemon; he was, in fact, the good genius, under whose special protection kings and the temples of gods were. On representations of a king's coronation one sees him pouring out of a vessel the emblems of life and power upon the ruler. In the symbols just mentioned the attributes of Ra (sun), Cneph (serpent), and Mut (vulture's wing) are combined.[1]

The Greeks agree in explaining the god Thoth as their Hermes, by reason of some few traits common to both. All inventions and sciences, even the art of writing, were derived from Thoth. He stands next to Osiris as divine author of human society and civilisation; as the former is introducer of agriculture, so is the latter of the finer accomplishments of life. Represented as an ibis-headed man, and symbolically by the ibis on a perch, with full or half moon on the head, and writing-tablets and stylus, he bears upon monuments the title of the "twice great," and is

[1] Wilkinson, 2nd Ser. i. 412.

called the writer of truth; and as knowledge is built upon writing, he is also the god of wisdom, has the credit of the authorship of the Hermetic books containing the holy traditions, and is a guardian god of Egyptian corporate bodies. The number of the Hermes cities in Egypt is a proof that his worship was a very general one there. A goddess, Nehemauai, with the emblem of the vulture, was his companion in the temples.[1] She, as other goddesses, is styled "daughter of the sun, the mistress of the heavens, the ruler of all the gods but Thoth, the lord of the divine language, who disposes the gods to benevolence." The third member of this triad was the sparrowhawk-headed Har-Horus[2]; but whether he is here conceived to be son of the two first, and Nehemauai, therefore, only a form of Isis, is not clear. Thoth was besides a deity of the moon, an Egyptian Deus Lunus, and as such is styled on the monuments Aah or Joh, a name also borne by Osiris. According to Plutarch, he was, as moon-god, hermaphrodite. His animal representative in this capacity was the dog-headed ape, Cynocephalus.[3]

In regard to many of the Egyptian deities accounts are wanting from which one may decide with certainty upon their signification. In Ombos a god Sebek was worshipped, who was represented with a crocodile head. Two deities, a male and a female, appear with heads of frogs; and as, according to Horapollo's statement, the frog was the hieroglyphic emblem of the human embryo, it is possible these gods may have been of a cosmogonic nature.[4] The Nile-god Hapi-Mou, represented as a corpulent man with water-plants on his head and in his hands, had priests of his own in all the cities situate on the shore of the stream. In Silfilis he was worshipped as the third member of a triad composed of Ra, Phthah, and himself, in which the radical notion seems to have been that the Nile was the product of the two others, the primal generative power and the sun.[5] The account of Heliodorus,[6] that the Egyptians considered the Nile, whose festival they kept with great zeal in preference to all others, as their greatest god, is corroborated by the title given to him of "father of the fathers of the

[1] Champollion-Figeac, *Egypte Anc.* p. 249.
[2] Brugsch, *Reiseber.* i. 5.
[3] Wilkinson, 2nd Ser. ii. 5.
[4] *Ibid.* i. 256.
[5] *Ibid.* ii. 58.
[6] *Æthiop.* ix. p. 423.

gods"; an evidence, as the same Heliodorus proceeds to remark, that those who were knowing in the mysteries saw in him the Osiris, who, again, on his part, approximated to the supreme god, Ra, even to identity. We know but little of the local deities Paytnuphis at Pselcis, Amenebis at Tschonemyris, and indeed Antæus also, from whom the city Antæopolis received its name. He has been turned euhemeristically by Diodorus into one of the governors under Osiris: his name may have been Entes, from which the Greeks formed Antæus.[1]

If Plutarch is right in explaining the name of Neith by "I came from myself," there is contained in it a clear expression of the essence of the oldest Egyptian goddesses, as the primitive maternal matter, just as in their ordinary designations of these beings as goddess-mother, or mother of the gods; hence Neith is also called the cow which bore the sun. That Greeks, like Plato, should have recognised Athene in her, is founded rather on accidental resemblances; for no Egyptian deity corresponds perfectly with a Greek one. Her principal seat of worship was at Sais in the Delta; she had also another at Latopolis (Esneh) in Upper Egypt, the town receiving its name from the Laton, a fish of the Nile, sacred to her. In later times her cultus appears to have dispossessed that of Pascht, the goddess of Bubastis.[2]

In the Theban triad this same mother-goddess was Mut; while at Bubastis the Pascht, the "bride of Phthah," also worshipped in many other places of Upper and Lower Egypt, had a like signification. The Greeks thought they discerned an Artemis in her. Represented with a lion's or cat's head, she is also styled the mistress of Memphis: she was called too the great lady of the fire, and on the island Philæ, "the living, flame-consuming goddess."[3] She was, then, at the same time a fire-goddess; this association of her with Phthah being probably a principal cause why the Greeks discovered in him their god of fire, Hephæstos. With the lion-head she stood, or rather sat, as sentinel at the gates of kingly palaces and temples; and as the Egyptian goddess-mothers generally melted into one

[1] Letronne, *Recueil des Insc. d'Egypte*, i. 32.
[2] Brugsch, *Reiseberichte*, p. 77.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 263.

another, she bore accordingly on inscriptions the names of Mut, Sati, and Anuke, and was combined with Ammon-Ra as well as with Phthah.[1]

In Neben * the Greeks recognised a goddess of child-birth, whom they therefore termed Eileithuia, and the city in which she was principally worshipped they gave the same name to. In fact, she also appears on the sculptures of the temple at Hermonthis, which Cleopatra caused to be erected on the birth of Cæsarion, as goddess of birth, present at the delivery of the goddess Ritho, who was figured there as bearing the divine child Harphre.[2] But Neben was also a moon-goddess, and hence is called Selene by the Greeks: connected with Thoth, as Luna with Lunus, she was the mother of Horus. She was represented as a vulture; and at the full moon a swine, an animal otherwise so odious to the Egyptians, was sacrificed to her. In the inscriptions to Eileithuia she bore the title, The first of all gods, mistress of the land "Put" (Phœnicia).[3]

The goddess Hathor seems to have developed in a more concrete and individual way among the Egyptians. The cities of Tentyra (house of Hathor) and Atarbechis, as the chief seats of her cultus, derived their names from her. To the Greeks she was Aphrodite Urania; a comparison, as far as it went, not unsuitable, as she too was, like the other goddesses,—like Mut and Pascht,—a cosmogonic being. Her titles were, "mistress of the heavens, ruler of the heavenly gods, the great queen of the golden crown, the golden one amongst the goddesses"; but her peculiar designation was, "lady of play and of song." That she was a "great mother," or a breeding nature-goddess, is shown in the beast that was sacred to her, the cow; and she is represented as a cow *semée* all over with spots in the shape of plants, sometimes with a human head, and not unfrequently with only cows' ears or cows' horns, and the sun's disk between. In her temple at Aboccis she is seen standing in the holy ship, in a cow's shape, while king and

[1] Orcurti, *Cat. dei Mon. Egiz. di Torino*, 1852, i. 44.

[* Or Saben. The reading "Neben" is founded on a corrupt style of inscription.—*Transl.*]

[2] Euseb. *Præp. Evg.* iii. 12.

[3] Brugsch, pp. 224, 225.

queen offer her flowers and libations.[1] At the principal places of her worship a sacred cow was kept;[2] and sometimes the goddess appears in the temple ornaments as a cow, giving milk to a king's child. Hathor passed into Isis when conceived as Amenta, and goddess of the lower world.

The goddess Anuke coincided with Hestia to the Greeks; nevertheless she was a fostering mother-goddess as well as the rest. In the temple at Beit-Ually, King Ramses the Second is delineated as drinking milk from the breasts of Isis as well as from those of Anuke; the latter is saying to him, "I thy mother, the mistress of Elephantine, take thee on my knees and offer thee my breast, that thou mayest receive thy nourishment therefrom."[3] Near of kin or identical with Anuke was Nephthys, in Egyptian Nebti, called in an inscription, "the helpful sister Anuke"; but the Greeks identified her, too, with their Aphrodite. Yet Nephthys was principally connected with Amenthe, the realm of the dead. She was the dark goddess to whom Osiris went down from the light of the upper world, and has her place in the two triads of the lower world: Osiris, Isis, and Nephthys; and Isis, Nephthys, and Harpocrates. The later Greeks made out the goddess Sate, a temple partner with Ammon, to be Hera; while Herodotus speaks of that goddess as one of those who were quite unknown to the Egyptians. To her, too, the vulture was given as an attribute of maternity. In a Nubian temple an Ethiopian king, Ergamun, is called a son of Neph, born of Sate, fed and fostered by Anuke; and over against it the same king is "son of Osiris, born of Isis, fed and fostered by Nephthys." Horapollo's statement that Athene (Neith) was the upper heaven, and Hera (Sata) the lower heaven, of the Egyptians, is probably a later interpretation imposed under Greek influence.

The most enigmatical phenomenon of the Egyptian religious system is the god the Greeks denominated Typhon, Set, Seti, or Sutech, the local god of Ombos, and hence also called Nub or Nubti. He was drawn with the head or the figure of an unknown (or fabulous) beast of yellow colour, with high docked ears, curved snout, and long stiffly

[1] Wilkinson, 2nd Ser. i. 389. [2] Ælian. *Hist. An.* x. 27.
[3] Champollion-Figeac, *Egypte ancienne*, p. 248.

erected tail, and was not distinguishable from the Phœnician god Baal similarly represented. In inscriptions of Kings Seti the first and Ramses the third, he is invoked under the three forms of Set, Nub, and Baal, as the "great god, the lord of the heavens," and associated with Horus.[1] Probably Set or Sutech had already come before the time of the Hyksos from the stranger (Western Asia) into Egypt, and received worship there. When the Hyksos, then, had gained a firm footing in the land, they recognised in him their national god. Their strong city Avaris was sacred to Typhon.[2] On an old papyrus is found the remarkable statement that the king Apepi, the leader of the insurgents (Aphobis, the fourth of the Phœnician shepherd-kings), before whom the whole land presented itself to make offerings, chose himself the god Sutech for master, built him a temple, and would serve no other god who was in Egypt. This points to what there is other evidence of, a contest and dispossession of the old Egyptian gods by the stranger and interloper, Sutech or Baal; and the myths bear this out.[3] The sacerdotal saga told how the Egyptian gods laid aside their crowns when they saw the supremacy of the Typhon;[4] or that the gods, upon Typhon their enemy coming suddenly into Egypt, changed themselves into beasts for fear of him:[5]—which they did, according to Diodorus, in order to escape from the godlessness and savage cruelty of earth-born men, *i.e.* the Hyksos. This is, on one side, a manifestation of the effort made to give a mythical foundation to the cultus of beasts, which became unintelligible to the priests themselves afterwards; and, on the other, is a tradition of the religious struggle which the Phœnician invasion brought about. And if the Greeks gave the name of Heracleopolis to the city Sethro (the tower of Set[6]), lying to the west of Pelusium, a designation lately found unintelligible,[7]

[1] Lepsius (*Æg. Götterk.* p. 206) reads Bar; but E. Poitevin, in the *Rev. Arch.* 1855, Aug. p. 263, remarks that the true reading is Bel or Baal. Gesenius translates the name of the town Baal-Tsephon by "locus Typhonis, Typhoni sacer."

[2] Manetho, Fragm. in the *Fragmm. Hist. Græc.* ii. 579.

[3] Brugsch, "Æg. Studien" in the *Zeitschr. d. D. M. Ges.* ix. 209.

[4] Hellanic. *ap. Athen.* xv. p. 680. [5] Hygin. ii. 28.

[6] Or, according to Brugsch, "the city of Set the watcher."

[7] Schwenk, *Mythol. der Æg.*, second edition, p. 205.

the reason for it doubtless existed in their having recognised in the god of the city the Phœnician god Heracles (Baal).

When, on the expulsion of the Hyksos, a great restoration followed, Set or Typhon also by degrees assumed another form and meaning. The remembrance of the violence practised under cover of his name, and the oppression suffered from the hated strangers who served him, made him appear a terrible being, a persecutor of the Egyptian gods, and odious to them. His form and his name were cut away and destroyed on almost all the monuments. He now became the god of heat—specially burdensome, unhealthy, and parching to the Eygptians. And in the Osiris saga, in which he appears as murderer of Osiris, natural circumstances and historical recollections were confused together. On one papyrus he is invoked as "the god who is in the void, the almighty destroyer and waster."[1] In the whole of nature he steps in as the dark destructive principle. As an ass was to the Egyptians the type of their northern enemies, the dwellers of Syria and Palestine, so he came now to be represented with the head of an ass, and also as an ass lying down.[2] The evil crocodile too, and the ugly horse of the Nile (hippopotamus), were sacred to him. On certain festival days it was the custom to please the gods who bore ill-will to Typhon by affronting him in the creatures, his favourites, or that were sacred to him. Men with red hair were insulted, and the inhabitants of Coptos threw an ass down from the rocks.[3] By the giants, who, according to the testimony of Diodorus, were scourged by the priests in the temple of Osiris, we may fairly understand Typhon himself and his associates. But as he was still a potent and dreaded god, the contrary might also take place. If a calamitous hot wind arose, the priests took off quietly and secretly, at nighttime, one or other of the sacred beasts, of such, namely, as were holy to the anti-Typhonic deities, and terrified it at first with threats. But if the scourge continued, they slew it as a sacrifice,—not, as Plutarch thought, as a punishment for the evil spirit, but to appease him by putting to death a

[1] Reuvens, *Lettres sur les Papyrus*, 1830, i. p. 39.
[2] Parthey on *Plutarch*, p. 219.
[3] Plut. *Isid.* c. xxx.

creature that was hateful to him.[1] Still, his birthday, the third of the intercalary ones, remained a day of ill-luck, on which the kings attempted nothing, either in the way of business or care of their persons, till nighttime.

2. THE WORSHIP OF BEASTS

Herodotus was told this saga by Egyptian priests: Heracles (Khons) was exceedingly desirous of seeing Ammon, who had for a long time refused to let himself be seen. As Heracles did not relax in his entreaties, Ammon took the fleece off a ram, enveloped himself in it, keeping the severed head of the ram before him, and so showed himself to the other. This saga points to the origin of the cultus of beasts in Egypt, the grounds of which are to be sought in the want of seeing the hidden deity, and of being personally near him, and in the awe arising from the mysterious being and instincts of beasts, unintelligible to man. "What the images of the gods are to the Greeks," Olympiodorus said, "that the beasts are, to the Egyptian, symbols of the gods to whom they are consecrated." In truth, the Egyptian saw in the sacred beasts not mere symbols of the gods, or emblems of divine properties; the people worshipped beasts, as Plutarch observed, directly and immediately:[2] in their eyes they were the bearers and vessels of deity, the gods made them the medium of their intercourse with man. While the god selected the animal for his earthly dwelling, it was made possible to man to have him near, and by careful and respectful attention to testify his gratitude and acknowledgments. Instincts of animals, their wonderful forebodings of the future, the security and uniformity of animal life, all appeared to the Egyptian to confirm the notion that the beast was the habitation and organ of a higher being; and they fancied the god had chosen the beast for the purpose, but not man, who, as an individual being, willing and with a free choice of his own, stands opposed to the deity, and cannot be used by him as an instrument without a will.

It is certain, however, that neither the later Egyptians

[1] Plut. *Isid.* c. lxxiii. [2] *Ibid.* lxxi.

nor Greeks were any longer able to point out the true causes of the worship of beasts, and that the grounds suggested by the former to the latter were only inventions of their own, while the custom itself had become problematical and unintelligible to themselves: nevertheless they saw it maintaining a complete supremacy over the minds of the people. Whoever was not satisfied with the myth of the conversion of the gods into beasts at the time of the Typhonic persecution, would be referred to a supposed old custom of painting devices of beasts on military banners, or to the utility of various species of beasts, or to the policy of a certain king, who, by the introduction of their worship, thought to create a standing feud amongst the Egyptians.[1] As to Plutarch's notion of people abstaining from the flesh of the beasts and consecrating them, because, by putting them to death, they might incur the danger of parricide or fratricide, that could never be made to pass current as an explanation of the deification of beasts. Just as little would it be a genuine Egyptian doctrine that the souls of beasts generally belonged to the substance of the Typhon, and that they were worshipped in order not to rouse the rancour of this divine enemy of man.[2] The pantheistic ground too, alleged by Porphyry, that the deity, as the one spiritual substance, penetrates man and beast as well,[3] cannot be the true one, as the Egyptians never invoked living men, with the exception of the later kings. Still more strange do interpretations sound about the worshipping of particular species of beasts, such as Plutarch quotes: the cat was worshipped by the Egyptians because she conceives by the ear and brings forth by the mouth, qualities wherein she resembles intelligence; the crocodile because it has no organ of speech, like the deity who governs the world without sound or word. The shrew-mouse must needs be an object of adoration, because its eyes lie deep in the head, and she appears almost blind like the mole. All these forced and perverted interpretations were but proofs of the utter helplessness of the Greek as well as of the Egyptian priests: for even to these latter their own

[1] Diod. i. 37; Plut. *Isid.* c. 72.
[2] Plut. *l.c.* c. 73.
[3] Porph. *de Abst.* iv. 9.

cultus had become an enigma; they were no longer able to throw themselves into the state, or to descend to the level, of the popular mind, in which beast-worship had originated, although this cultus maintained itself in undiminished vigour as an hereditary ingredient of the national religion.

The statement of Herodotus, that all the animals in Egypt, domestic as well as wild, were considered holy, has to be limited in two respects: first, because there were many species of animals, such as the camel and the giraffe, not holy; and next, because only a few received a general worship, whilst the greater part had a particular district in which they were canonised; so that sometimes a beast which was worshipped in one district was eaten in the neighbouring one. Worship was universally paid to cattle, lions, cats, dogs, weasels, and otters; among the birds, to the sparrow-hawk, the hoopoe, the stork, and the sheldrake; and among fish, to the eel and lepidotus. The sheep was worshipped in Sais and the Thebaïs, but sacrificed and eaten in Lycopolis; because the wolf, there honoured as a god (in Lycopolis), kills and eats sheep. The hippopotamus in the district of Papremis, and the crocodile in the greater part of the land, were considered specially sacred, but the latter was chased and eaten in Tentyra and Apollinopolis;[1] the oxyrhynchus, worshipped in a city of the same name, was generally detested elsewhere; so, too, with the fish phagrus, the devotion of the Syenites. The sacred serpent Thermuthis, which served as head-gear for Isis, had holes in all the temples, where it was fed with veal fat.[2]

This diversity in the way of viewing and treating beasts led to regular religious wars. A contest of the kind broke out in Plutarch's time between the Oxyrhynchites and Cynopolites: the former had eaten an oxyrhynchus; the latter sacrificed a dog in reprisal. After much bloodshed, the Romans separated them by force.[3] A similar war is described by Juvenal between the Coptites and Tentyrites, during which a prisoner was actually devoured by the victors.[4] There could be no want of

[1] Strabo, 814; Æl. *H. N.* x. 24. [2] Ælian. x. 31. [3] Plut. *Isid.* c. 72.
[4] *Sat.* xv., in v. 35 of which read "Coptos" for "Ombos."

occasions for such wars; for the putting to death of a sacred animal was considered by its worshippers as the worst of crimes, and only to be expiated by death. Diodorus was witness to a Roman soldier's being put to death by the people, in spite of the intercession of the king, for having killed a cat by mistake: and in a case of fire, the Egyptians thought a great deal more of saving the holy cats than of extinguishing the flame. If any one fell in by accident with a dead animal in the fields, he remained on the spot, and whilst he sorrowed over the departed, protested that he had found it dead. Dead beasts were embalmed and put into sacred coffins; so that the country, which in fact might have been called a vast ark of holy beasts, is still full of them in a mummy state. Rats and swallows, frogs and toads were mummified, though not held sacred.

The holy animals required a numerous staff of attendants and nurses from the families where this service was hereditary. They had their own sacred buildings and courts; whole fields were set apart for their sustenance; great hunting expeditions were arranged in order to supply the birds of prey with flesh to their taste. Incense was burnt before them; they were washed, anointed, richly apparelled, and slept at night on soft cushions: the handsomest females of the species that could be found were brought to each. As each house and family had its holy beasts, the sorrow when it died was like that for a beloved child. If a cat died, all the members of the household cut off the hair of their eyebrows; but if a dog died, they shaved their heads and whole bodies.[1] Many cities had the privilege of having deposited within them the mummies of particular species of beasts from the whole of Egypt. The ibis was appropriated to Hermopolis, the sparrow-hawk to Buto, the cats to Bubastis, and a boat transmitted the oxen to the island Prosopitis.

The Egyptians consecrated their children by vow to these animals, or to the god to whom they were severally sacred. They shaved their heads entirely or partially, and took the weight of the hair in silver, which was expended to the use of the animal. Meanwhile there were

[1] Herod. ii. 66, 67; Diod. i. 85.

still worse customs, which throw a very clear light upon the notions people fostered of these beast-gods. For forty days Egyptian women, who at other times dared not so much as look upon him, were admitted to the newly discovered Apis, to expose their naked bodies to his view;[1] and at Mendes and Thmuis they actually prostituted themselves to the he-goats worshipped there with divine honours, a custom of which Pindar makes mention.[2] During the time Herodotus was in Egypt, this took place in public before the eyes of all; and the prohibition, so frequently repeated and so positively inculcated in the Pentateuch, against impurity with beasts, is explained when one considers in how many ways the Israelites were exposed to the sight of Egyptian habits and immoralities during their long sojourn in the Nile country; and they had to be formally interdicted the worship of the he-goat besides.[3]

Amongst the sacred beasts the first place was given to the divine bulls, of which the Egyptians worshipped four. The first, the possession of which Memphis gloried in, was called the Hapi-Bull (Apis), Phthah risen to life again. The second, Mnevis, in Heliopolis, was called "the sun returned to life"; the third was designated the "twice great and ancient god"; the fourth, "the great god and king of heaven." The worship of Apis and Mnevis, however, was not confined to these two cities, but extended over the whole of the Nile country;[4] that is, there were in other places also holy bulls who were worshipped as Apis and Mnevis, and in Memphis itself there was a Mnevis besides Apis.[5]

Thus Apis, or Hapi-Anch, styled the living Apis or Anenchi, *i.e.* the king of all divine animals, was called the second life of Phthah, and accordingly was an incarnation of that god, who held the post of supreme god at Memphis. But he was also Osorapis, or Osiris-Apis:[6] as in Memphis,

[1] Diod. i. 85.

[2] Strabo, 802; Herod. ii. 46; Clem. Al. *Cohort.* p. 9 (c. xxv. ?).

[3] Lev. xvii. 7.

[4] Brugsch, *Reiseber.* 313.

[5] Letronne, *Rec. des Inscr.* i. 296.

[6] Mention is made in a papyrus at Leyden of a certain Petesis who is styled ἀρχευταφιαστὴς τοῦ Ὀσοράπιος καὶ Ὀσοράμνιος, θεῶν μεγίστων. Reuvens, *Lettres*, iii. p. 50.

for instance, the old local god Phthah, the most spiritual creator-being, had begotten the sun-god Ra, *i.e.* himself in reality,[1] and Osiris, as the other and principally the nether-world aspect of Ra, was radically identical with him, so the priests could assert their Apis was the counterpart and beautiful type of the soul of Osiris,[2] or, in other words, Osiris (who showed himself as he was to the dead in Amenthe) revealed himself to the upper world as the Apis-Bull; and Serapis, or Osorapis, was exactly the same god, the dead bull identical with Osiris, and was represented like the Osiris of Amenthe, but with the head of a bull in addition. This cultus of the bull-god extends back to the times of the first dynasties. On the walls of the Serapeum at Memphis, Ramses the Great and his son already appear as offering a sacrifice to Serapis.[3]

According to Egyptian belief, the birth of Apis was quite miraculous. The cow that bore him, conceived him by lightning from heaven, or, if we follow Plutarch, by the generative light of the moon. He was known by twenty-nine signs, all of which he must have upon him; and amongst which the black colour, the form of an eagle, or rather vulture, in the back, and a wart on the tongue looking like a beetle, were the most important. Phthah, in fact, was an hermaphrodite, according to Horapollo, and that was indicated by the vulture and beetle: the other marks had reference to the stars, the inundation of the Nile, the shape of the world, and the like.[4] When found, after being fed on milk for forty days, he was conducted on board the sacred ship to Memphis, with a numerous retinue, where his enthronisation took place in the temple of Phthah, and where every endeavour was used to make his existence as agreeable to him as possible. The cow that bore him was taken care of and honoured along with him, and the fairest cows that could be procured were kept for him in apartments of their own. The man from whose stock he was bred was looked upon as the most fortunate of mortals; when Apis was exhibited in public, the attendants made room for him, and a troop of boys accompanied him singing

[1] Lepsius, *Æg. Götterkreis*, p. 213.
[2] Plut. *Isid.* c. xx.
[3] Brugsch, *Reiseber.* 33.
[4] Ælian. *H. A.* xi. 10.

hymns. He gave oracles, partly by eating out of the hands of those who consulted him, which was considered a lucky omen, and partly by inspiring the youths who played before his sanctuary with prophetical answers in verse. Yet he was not allowed to live more than twenty-five years *—an Apis period; longer, it seems, the soul of Osiris would not dwell within him. If he did not die before that time, he was drowned in the sacerdotal spring with much solemnity, whereupon people went into mourning, and another was looked out. If he died a natural death, then the whole of Egypt mourned for him till a fresh one was found; he was embalmed and buried in the most splendid way at a great expense. Under Psammetichus the cultus of Apis received a new impulse; and that vast subterranean necropolis discovered quite lately was built with the temple, or mausoleum, over it, which thenceforward, up to the Roman times, received all the Apis corpses. Even the Greeks, whom the Egyptian priests gulled into the belief that their infernal Dionysos was no other than Osiris or Osorapis, pressed in to invoke their deity in his primeval domicile; yet their sacred writings (proskynemen †) were not allowed a place in the Serapeum proper, where only Egyptian formulæ of invocation were admitted: the Greek ones were remitted to a pastophorion of their own, connected with the Serapeum by a long gallery.[1]

3. THE LOWER WORLD, AND THE DESTINY OF MAN AFTER DEATH

According to the testimony of Herodotus, the Egyptians were the first, along with the immortality of the soul, to adopt the doctrine of its migration into other bodies, and from them the Pythagoreans borrowed their metempsy-

[* This assertion of the Greeks is at variance with the recent discoveries. The Apis born in the 28th year of Sheshonk III. lived twenty-six years. Mariette thus concludes his *Memoir* on the Apis-bulls. "Nos Apis meurent à tous les âges. . . . La période d'Apis me paraît définitivement enterrée." *Bull. Arch.* 1855, p. 100.—*Transl.*]

[† προσκυνητικά or προσκυνήματα?—*Tr.*]

[1] Maury in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, 1853, ii. 1073.

chosis.[1] No other people of pre-Christian times brought its ideas of the lower world, and the state of men after death, into such complete form, even to the minutest details, or had built up upon them so strong and definitive a system, carefully guarded and traditionised by the priesthood. It is one of the problems of history how this remarkable people, whilst having so high an idea of the future life and of its advantages over the present, contrived to cling at the same time with such a tenacious obstinacy to a system of beast-worship as complete as it could be.

Metensomatosis was the belief that the human soul, after death, was bound to wander a Sothis period of three thousand years, passing through the bodies of beasts, and then to return again into a human form. It lay at the root of the Egyptian notions of Hades, and their manner of dealing with the dead.[2] The fragments of Hermetic writings contain more precise information on the point; but it remains quite uncertain how much of them was genuine Egyptian, and how much Greek addition of later date. According to these, souls were expelled the society of the deity into an earthly existence, on account of some guilt or defilement, and then experienced many migrations. From creeping creatures they turn into water animals, from these again into land animals, then birds, and lastly men; but as men they receive the beginnings of immortality, and so, becoming demons, they at last attain to the choir of the gods.[3]

If, as is to be inferred from the account of Herodotus, human life appeared to the Egyptians like a great circle, embracing past and future in infinite alteration, then the judgment of the dead formed the decisive moment, or knotty point, each time. Osiris, since his death on earth, is judge and king in the Amenthi of the nether world, "the region of life, the hidden country." In the delineations of the assize court of the dead, found on the rolls (of papyrus)

[1] Herod. ii. 123. It is not the doctrine of immortality pure which Herodotus indicated as a discovery of the Egyptians, which one might suppose from reading Dunker (*Gesch. des Alterth.* i. 70, 2nd edition), and Uhlemann (*Thoth*, p. 58), but that doctrine in the form of the dogma of the migration of souls.

[2] Herod. *l.c.*; *Aen. Gaz.*; Theophr. p. 10, ed. Boiss.

[3] *Ap. Stob. Eclog. Phys.* pp. 950, 1000 sqq.

put into the grave along with the departed, he appears as a mummy with his bands unswathed, and with crown, scourge, and crooked staff, the tokens of his dignity. Three other gods are occupied in the trial, the first of whom is the jackal-headed Anubis, who is also the guardian of the grave. He is busy at one end of the scales,—that in which the actions of the dead are put,—while the hawk-headed Horus regulates the index of the balance; and Thoth, with his ibis-head, the Egyptian Hermes Psychopompos, "the master of the holy tongue," writes down the result. In the books of the dead, prayer is addressed to him that he would do justice to the dead, suffer truth to come to the body, and keep falsehood at a distance from it.[1] Osiris has forty-two divine assessors, before whom the defunct has to make a negative confession of his sins; that is, he must justify himself before each of them to the effect that he has not committed any of the forty-two principal sins. The Book of the Dead makes him say, "I have not stolen, murdered, lied, slandered, or committed adultery; I have not robbed the gods of their sacrifices, nor consumed what was dedicated to the temple, not dishonoured a high-priest or a divine master, not refused the beasts their food, not insulted the geese belonging to a god, nor slaughtered an ox of theirs; I have not allowed any one to hunger, thirst, or lament; I have abused neither the king nor my father."

In each case the relations, as was natural, were given to suppose that their kinsman had passed safely through this judgment; hence he was conceived to be in such close union with Osiris that he now bore his very name in conjunction with his own. As to what is the condition of the dead after the trial is over, what advantages and blessings are his portion in Amenthi, that we have to collect from the monuments and the scrolls found with the mummies. "Thy body," it is there said, "is now pure by water and alcali" (*i.e.* by being mummified); "no limb in thee is impure. Cleansed from all evil and assoilsied, thou comest to the judgment-seat; here the goddesses of truth have purified thee: thou art justified for eternity. Brilliant and white thou seest Ra (the sun), and the god Atum in the

[1] Brugsch, *Saï an Sinsin*, p. 9.

realm of shades. Ammon gives thee thy spirit, and Phthah joins thy members together, and thy soul is admitted into the boat with Osiris. There is prepared thee now the repast of the dead—bread, beverages, oxen, geese, and libations; thou drinkest and eatest with thy mouth, and receivest sacrificial cakes with the souls of the gods. Anubis accompanies thee, and Thoth writes thee thy book of migration with his fingers; by it thy soul wanders ever: thy heart is now the heart of Ra, thy members the members of the mighty Horus. Thou seest with thine eyes, and hearest with thine ears; thou speakest with thy mouth, and steppest forth with thy feet: thy divine soul is in heaven to execute every transformation thou desirest. Ammon grants to thee to appear each day on the earth; Horus, the avenger of his father, accompanies thy godlike body, whilst thy soul tarries in the place of all the gods, and betakes itself to the sanctuary that is pleasing to it. It lives in heaven, and thy body lives in Tattu (the place of earthly burial). Thou livest now in truth, thou eatest in truth; for thou hast given bread to the hungry, water to the thirsty, and clothing to the naked; thou hast offered cakes to the gods, and mortuary repasts to the white shining ones (the dead). Mayest thou now live, and receive thy book of migrations, and fulfil all thy metamorphoses; may thy soul attain to every sanctuary well pleasing to it."[1]

Thus man after death, when he has stood his trial, leads in some sense a double existence. On one side the soul remains in lasting relations to its earthly body, which was therefore purified by the most careful embalming, protected from corruption, and made to last through thousands of years. On the strength of this firm belief, then, the Egyptians surpassed all people in the care and expense which they lavished upon their places of sepulture, "the eternal habitations," as they called them. The houses of the living were to them but as inns, about which, as they must soon be left, one need not much trouble oneself. But the places of burial, which were bought ready prepared from the priests, richly adorned with pictures and sculptures, consisted of upper and lower chambers, and were often cut out of the rock;

[1] Brugsch, *Saï an Sinsin*, pp. 25–32.

though, indeed, the mummies of the poorer were stowed away in simpler and public rooms. Often, too, the mummies were set up in the family house, in a chamber of their own built for the purpose. Hence it was that in the formularies of prayer Ra or Osiris was invoked to secure the body lasting thousands of days, and never corrupting,[1] or that the dead might go to and fro in the tomb.[2] The god Anubis was the presiding genius of the mummified body; it was said of him that he dwelt in the body, or in the intestines, and made the limbs of the departed; and in the inscriptions he addresses the dead: "I come, I bring thee thy members."[3] This possession of a body, into which the soul, when it pleased, might return again, appears to have been looked upon as one of the greatest benefits which fell to the lot of the justified, *i.e.* the approved in the judgment. An inscription says: "Thy head belongs to thee, thou livest by it; thine eye is thine, thou seest by it; thine ears belong to thee, thou hearest through them; thy nose is thine, thou breathest through it"; and Tapheru, or Anubis, was besought to allow the dead to go to and fro in Kernuter (the lower world), and with his nostrils inhale the midnight air.[4]

But souls also stood in need of physical nourishment; and, indeed, the same as they had enjoyed in the life on earth. Hence it is one of the commonest prayers in the dead-inscriptions, "May Phthah-Sokari-Osiris vouchsafe good dwelling, provide with victuals, with the flesh of oxen and geese, with perfumes, wine and milk, wax and fillets, and all other pure goods, in which the divine life consists."[5] The surviving kinsmen did not allow of there being any want of suchlike gifts and oblations; the more so because the dead was obliged, even in the life beyond the grave, to be presenting continually the same offerings of provision to the gods. The Osirian Famonth cries, "I bring hither gifts of bread, drinks, oxen, and geese, and of all offerings good and beseeming thee, Osiris."[6] Another supplicates he may pour out

[1] Orcurti, ii. 100. [2] *Ibid.* ii. 25. 47. [3] *Ibid.* ii. 114.
[4] *Ibid.* ii. 114. 47. [5] *Ibid.* ii. 20.
[6] Brugsch, *Samml. Demot. Urk.* i. 28.

libations well-pleasing to the father Ra,[1] or asks Osiris to secure him a good grave and libations from his son; or, "Osiris, grant me all provisions from the altar, all gifts every day." And in the Book of the Dead it is said, "All who love him will come to his dwelling; loaves and drinks and wax will be supplied him from Ra's altar."[2] Then the representations show the dead person too, as he is receiving honours and alms from his heirs—sometimes as sacrificing to the gods.

The Egyptians, like other people of antiquity, imagined the human soul, not as a pure intellectual immaterial existence, but as a corporeal substance, only of finer texture, which in the life beyond goes through many migrations until purified (and in that state it is represented in the form of a sparrow-hawk with human head); it soars upward to the full contemplation of the divine sunlight.[3] No less than seventy-five transformations of the soul are delineated on the tombs.[4] The bliss, however, to which the man is at last to attain, they pictured to themselves to be, not a state of quiet contemplation, but rather believed that the eternised there pursued the occupations of this life, and ploughed, and sowed, and reaped, and threshed, on the celestial fields.[5] The Book of the Dead says, "he is in the midst of these things, as he was upon earth;"[6] and there are pictures of the dead with a plough, signifying their employment in the other world, and a bag of corn.[7] There is, also, no want there of heavenly provision; for mention is often made of the tree of the goddess Nutpe, from which the blest receive water and bread,[8] and of a stream of which they drink every day.[9]

Thus the dead lead a double life. They visit often and with joy the sanctuaries of the gods, as well as their own earthly shell which they have left behind them; and what high value was on that account attached to this is evinced by every member being placed under the special protection of a guardian god of its own, the

[1] Orc. ii. 25. [2] *Ibid.* ii. 202. [3] Brugsch, *Erk. Æg. Denk.* p. 63.
[4] De Rougé, *Mém. sur l'Inscr. du Tombeau d'Ahmès*, p. 56.
[5] Lepsius, *Todtenbuch*, xii. [6] Orc. ii. 202. [7] *Ibid.* ii. 58.
[8] Brugsch, *Erk.* p. 24. [9] Orc, ii. 25.

whole body, therefore, being protected by nineteen gods.[1] To this is to be added the shielding might of the god Seb, whose province the region of graves appears to have been: hence the oft-repeated formula, "In heaven he is before Phre, on earth his body is before Seb"; or, "Thy soul lives in heaven with the sun, and thy body is well to do in the dwelling of the stars (the grave)."[2] Hence it is Seb who, on a monument, makes the king Amenophis-Memmon inhale the divine life, whilst he holds to his nostrils the cross with handle, the symbol of this life,[3] though Osiris also is invoked for air to supply breath to the dead.[4]

To behold the sun in his beauty, to perform his whole periodic course with him, and thus to be admitted into the bark of the sun-god and the society of the gods who steer it,[5]—in this consists the recompense of the zealous servant of the gods, the enjoyment of bliss. The justified, the "Osirised," speak constantly of such joys, of their view of the divine light and their own brightness, and of the transformations they have undergone at their pleasure; to these latter also belong the alternate visit and sojourn of the soul, sometimes in its mural chamber and mummy, at others in the various apartments of Amenthi and the starry heavens. But it is not a migration of the soul through the bodies of beasts that is meant; for that is one of the punishments of the wicked. Such punishments are mentioned here and there, but not frequently, on the monuments. The Book of the Dead has it that the forty-two judges and assessors of Osiris compel the wicked to eat of their own blood on the day of the "reckoning of words."[6] The bitch-dog of the nether world, the Egyptian Cerberus, tears the heart of one who comes in sin.[7] On a sepulchral picture, a soul damned by the divine judge is brought back again to earth in a bark: his soul has passed into a swine, over which the word "gluttony," his principal sin, is inscribed.[8] Another representation shows the

[1] Brugsch, *Erk.* 62; Lepsius, *Todtenb.* 10.
[2] Orc. ii. 53.
[3] Le Normant, *Mus. des Ant. égypt.* p. 4.
[4] Orc. ii. 60.
[5] Orc. ii. 202; cf. Brugsch, *Reiseber.* 331.
[6] Orc. ii. 207.
[7] Brugsch, *Saï an Sinsin*, p. 9.
[8] Le Normant, *Musée des Ant. ég.* p. 20.

souls of the damned kneeling with hands bound behind their backs, and a stream of blood pouring from their heads: one of them is hanging by the feet, decapitated; others drag their hearts on the ground, or are thrown into a caldron of boiling water.[1] According to the accounts of Theophrastus, the Egyptians believed that the soul, after the completion of its migrations through the different species of animals, returned back again to the human body which it originally occupied;[2] this, probably, might take effect after the expiration of a Sothis period of three thousand years, but apparently it was a new human body in which the purified soul began its second earthly career.

To that court of the lower world of Osiris and his assessors there corresponded an earthly one, which was still held as late as the time of Diodorus, that is, the beginning of the Christian era. When the embalmed corpse arrived at the shore of the lake, which separated him from the place of burial, any one who thought himself injured by the deceased, or knew ill of him, could appear as his accuser before the forty-two judges there assembled. If the transgression was a grave one, burial was refused, and the relations were obliged to take the corpse back with them to the house, and place the mummy there; whereupon they could only procure permission for the entombment by payment of his debts, or satisfaction of the complainant by money. But if the dead was acknowledged innocent, or no accuser appeared, the relations laid their mourning aside, pronounced the panegyric of the departed, in which the assembled crowd agreed, and prayed for his beatification; and then the corpse was borne across the lake to the necropolis.

4. FESTIVALS, PRIESTHOOD, AND SACRIFICE

The number of the festivals and hallowed times and days was greater among the Egyptians than among any other people of antiquity, not excepting even the feast-loving

[1] Le Normant, *l.c.*; Champol. *Lettres d'Egypte*, p. 233.
[2] Wilkinson, 2nd Ser. ii. 444.

Athenians. These festivals had relation to the course of the sun, to the Nile, to birthdays of the gods, and specially to the great contest between Osiris and Seti. In a religion in which the sun-worship was so dominant, the whole calendar and all the periods of time, great or small, had a religious character. The gods were the rulers of times and seasons. Every month and day, says Herodotus, was governed by a god;[1] computation of times was only made in the name of the gods and in accordance with their worship. Thus they kept two new-year's days; for the Egyptians had a fixed and natural solar year of three hundred and sixty-five days and a quarter, and another movable one of three hundred and sixty-five days without intercalation; and the most of their feasts ranged throughout all the seasons, so that it took fourteen hundred and sixty-one years to complete the whole cycle.[2] The close of the year was also solemnised: twelve festivals of the first day of each month, and of the sixteenth day or half month, and the beginning of the three seasons of the year, each of four months. There was a feast of the rising of the star Sothis (the dog-star); others had reference to the regular rise and fall of the Nile, to seed-time and harvest, to the solstices and equinoxes: and there were others kept of the great and little heat, and of the five intercalary days.[3] According to Herodotus, the principal festivals in honour of the highest gods were the feast of Bubastis, in the city of the same name; of Isis in Busiris, of Neith in Sais, of Ammon in Heliopolis, of Leto or Buto in the town so called, and of Ares in Papremis. He seems to have had no acquaintance with the festivals in Upper Egypt.

Peculiar childbed feasts were also kept; for the moment in which a goddess had given birth to the third person of a divine triad, always represented as a child, was of the highest import in the Egyptian point of view. The places where this happened, or even where the commemoration only of the childbirth was observed, were hallowed. Thus it is said in an inscription at Ombos, "This is the land and the place of the delivery of the goddess Ape" (represented as the hippopotamus); "being in labour she

[1] Herod. ii. 82.
[2] *Gemin. Isag.* c. 6, p. 42, Halma.
[3] Brugsch, *Reiseb.* p. 97; Erklär. *Aeg. Denkm.* p. 43.

bore her son on this spot."[1] Hence a smaller temple was frequently attached to the larger, containing the Mammisi, or room of the divine childbirth. At Ombos the small temple formed a double Mammisi, where the births of Khons-Horus, the son of Hathor and of Sebek-Ra, and again that of Pnebto, son of the goddess Tasennufre and of Arueris, were delineated.[2] In Hermonthis the last Cleopatra had a Mammisi erected in memory of the birth of her son Cæsarion, in which the goddess Ritho is represented as being delivered of her son Harphre. All the stages of the delivery are there depicted, and the presence of the Egyptian Lucina—the goddess Suben, the guardian of childbirth, is unfailing.

Of the six universal festivals, that of lamps at Sais was one, and was solemnised in honour of Osiris, who was buried in the temple of Neith there. At night all Egypt was illuminated with lamps. An image of Osiris, with triple phallus, was carried in procession on the Pamylia, his birthday feast.[3] The festival at Busiris was set apart for mourning for the death of Osiris: a bull was sacrificed, and consumed by fire, on which all beat their breasts, and the Carians living in Egypt slashed themselves on the forehead with knives.[4] Two days afterwards, the feast of the finding and resuscitation of Osiris was celebrated. People went down to the sea with the sacred chest and a golden vessel; and whilst the latter was filled with drinking-water, those present cried, "We have found him; good luck!" Then a little image of the sickle-shaped moon was prepared of rich earth, mixed with water, and was clothed and ornamented. It is impossible to say whether the rite signified anything more than that the earth, drenched with water, is all-productive.[5] Several feasts of Isis mourning, and of her search, appear to have been generally celebrated. One of the kind, according to Plutarch, lasted four days. The priests performed rites of gloomy import, and exhibited, as an image of the goddess lamenting her deceased husband, a gilded cow enveloped in black byssus. In the delineation of another festival of the kind, it is said, "Isis laments her lost son with her dog's head (Anubis) and the

[1] Brugsch, *Reiseb.* 278. [2] Champollion-Fig. *Anc. Egypt.* 253.
[3] Herod. ii. 62. [4] *Ibid.* ii. 61; Diod. i. 85. [5] Plut. *Isid.* c. 39.

bald priests,—cries and seeks; and when she has found her child, Isis is soon gladdened, the priests rejoice, and the dog's head, as finder, swells with pride."[1] Typhon or Seti had to be scared with the sistrum, the customary instrument for noise, on the occasion; and on the finding of Osiris was overpowered: in the month Payni people baked sacrificial cakes with the stamp of an ass, tied and bound, as a token of this conquest.

The feast of Artemis (Pascht) at Bubastis is declared by Herodotus to have been the finest of all. Great crowds of men and women—there might be as many as seven hundred thousand in all—embarked on the Nile with cymbals, flutes, singing, and clapping of hands; a terrific noise was kept up. At every city they passed, the women either exposed themselves, or addressed indecent raillery to the women of the place; and then the feast was solemnly held in Bubastis with great sacrificing and a tremendous consumption of wine.[2] No less strange were the usages of the festival of the Egyptian Ares at Papremis. The image of the god was carried in its chest of wood, attended by thousands of armed men, into the temple of his mother. In the court of the temple was a company of priests provided with cudgels, who guarded the entrance against the god as he arrived. It ended in a fight, in which, in spite of the assurances of the Egyptians to the contrary, always some lost their lives.[3] The god, it seems, was his mother's husband in this case also; and when he had wished for her company—so the tradition ran—he had met with a similar repulse.

The greater part of the festal action and of holy days referred to the great contest of gods, in which Osiris, Horus, Sebek, and Set, with the goddesses Isis and Nephthys, took a part. The alternations in this struggle gave the whole year sometimes a cheerful, at others a gloomy complexion, and converted the days into lucky, or pregnant with fate. The victories were observed by gods in heaven, and therefore by men on earth also. We find these prescriptions in an old papyrus calendar. "On the twelfth of Choiak no one is to go out of doors, for on that day the transformation of Osiris into the bird Wennu took place; on the

[1] Minuc. Felix, c. 21. [2] Herod. ii. 60. [3] *Ibid.* ii. 19. 63.

fourteenth of Toby no voluptuous songs must be listened to, for Isis and Nephthys bewail Osiris on that day. On the third of Mechir, no one can go on a journey, because Set undertook one of his hostile expeditions. On the fourteenth of Mechir, Sebek received the blow on the god's boat—let no one go out on that day; and let nothing be looked at on the twenty-ninth till sunset, because Set on that day was in his most infuriated state." On the other hand, the ninth of Paophi was a very lucky day, for the gods rejoiced at having encountered their enemy Seti upon it. A child born on it died only in advanced old age. On the seventh of Mechir, and several other days, were consecrated the oblations made to the dead. Other days related to the laments of Nephthys and Isis for their brother Osiris in Abydos, and the contests of Sebek, Thoth, and Horus with Seti.[1]

At no time in Egypt was there a special high-priest, who, as being supreme head of a priest caste, with a hierarchical organisation, was also head of the whole religious system. Polytheism did not admit of this here. But as the kings in the older times also actually belonged to the priest class and performed sacerdotal functions,—so much so that the temples were at the same time palaces and fortresses of considerable strength,—they may have supplied the place of a high-priest in many respects.[2] Besides, there were as many high-priests as temples, for each temple had its own body of priests. Regularly the priesthood was perpetuated in families, and yet without their composing a strictly exclusive priest caste; so that the Indian caste system, as a whole, has been wrongly attributed to Egypt. A union of offices of different kinds in one person was, on the contrary, very common. Priests might be military commanders, governors of provinces, judges, and architects; they were invested with offices which might also be administered by laymen. The sacerdotal families, too, were by no means rigorously exclusive; we find the daughter of a priest marrying a soldier, as, in fact, Joseph, a stranger, though naturalised in the country, received the daughter of the high-priest of On,

[1] De Rougé, in the *Revue Archéol.* 1853, pp. 687–691.
[2] Leemans, *Lettre à Salvolini*, p. 14.

Heliopolis, to wife. Soldiers sometimes had priests for sons, and, *vice versâ*, the son of the priest went into the army; or, of three brothers, one was a priest, another a soldier, and the third held a civil employment.[1]

Accordingly the body of priests attached to each temple formed a corporation consisting of many orders. These gradations or classes were styled, according to their Greek designations, prophets, stolists, hiero-grammatists, horologists or horoscopists, hymnodists, and pastophori.[2] The most distinguished, the prophets, were the most deeply learned of the Egyptians, whom Clement, therefore, ranks as philosophers with the wisest of other nations. They carried a water-jug in processions, water being the element of all things; or, as Plutarch says, because all moisture, the Nile especially, was an emanation from Osiris.[3] They administered and divided the temple revenues, took care the gods were properly represented in images, and that the holy animals were supplied to their temples.[4] They were obliged to learn by heart the ten hieratical books, treating of the laws of the gods and the whole discipline of the priesthood. The stolists, too, belonged to the more distinguished orders of priests. Porphyry says they were in possession of the true philosophy, and strict observers of all the dietetic maxims of the priests.[5] But their principal avocation was the vesting and unvesting of the images, for even the bas-reliefs on the temple walls were clothed. They had also to look after the priests being properly vested, as they changed their vestments according to their functions. At the same time moschosphragistia was one of their duties, *i.e.* they marked the beasts that had been previously examined and destined for sacrifice, bound the horns with papyrus straw, and set their seal upon them.[6] Whoever sacrificed an animal not having this seal was punished with death. The temple scribes, or priests of the scriptures, had important matters to occupy them; for instance, the search for, and examination of, Apis, in

[1] Ampère, *Revue Archéol.* 1849, pp. 408–416.

[2] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. p. 633; Porphyr. *Abstin.* iv. 6; Synes. *de Provid.* p. 65.

[3] Vitruv. *de Archiv.* lib. viii. præf.

[4] Synes. *Encom. Calv.* p. 50; Ælian. *N. A.* xi. 10.

[5] *De Abstin.* iv. 6, 8.

[6] Porphyr. *de Abst.* iv. 7.

common with the prophets, to whom, therefore, they were next in rank. Like them, they belonged to the class of Egyptian philosophers; their scientific acquirements embraced the province of hieroglyphics, cosmography and geography, astronomy, and the natural history of the Nile. They were acquainted with the holy sagas, or principles of religious observances; and the demands upon them on that account do seem to have been not unimportant; for the temple scribe Pancrates required a twenty-three years' course of study in order to attain a complete mastery of the whole of Egyptian learning. In processions, they appear with feathers on the head, and papyrus scrolls and implements of writing in their hands.[1] It was to them that numbers of Greeks resorted, who were desirous of becoming acquainted with Egyptian tradition and science.[2] Lastly, to the intelligent orders of the priesthood we must add the horoscopists or horologists, to whom the province of astrology was specially assigned. In processions, they are known by the astrological symbols of the palm-branch and the horologe.[3]

The pastophori or colchytes are more frequently mentioned than these latter. In procession they carried little temples or shrines, in which there was an image of a god. At the same time, they practised the art of medicine, exclusively limited to the priest class in Egypt; but in it were bound strictly to the letter of the Hermetic books. The "singers" were to have two of the Hermes books; one of the hymns of the gods, the other of rules for the life of a king. There was, besides, the lower class of ministers, called comastæ, temple porters, and guardians of the temple treasures; all these were generally not subjected to the same rigorous course of life and abstinences as the higher were obliged to, or, at least, not in the same degree.

The priests, in fact, led a life burdened and fenced about with an infinite number of rules and prohibitions, the violation of which, even the significant ones, entailed degradation and removal.[4] They did not show themselves

[1] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 633; Ælian. *N. A.* xi. 10; Lucian, *Philopseud.* xxxiv.
[2] Jamblich. *de Myst.* i. 1.
[3] Horap. i. 42, 49; Porph. *Abst.* iv. 6.
[4] Porph. *Abst.* iv. 5, 6.

much in public, except on religious solemnities; their hands were always kept under their dress, consisting of a white linen garment. Always bald, their whole bodies were shaven every three days, particularly beard and eyebrows; they washed twice a day and twice every night in cold water; and prepared themselves for their more important religious duties by abstinences of seven, sometimes as many as forty-two, days beforehand.[1] They were generally prohibited a number of kinds of food. Beans they durst not so much as look at, to say nothing of eating, so impure were they held to be. To taste wheat or barley, or bake bread of either, would have been a serious crime for them, as for every Egyptian; and a priest was not allowed to eat fish. All this had its religious meaning. A priest could not, for instance, eat onions, because they ordinarily grow best at the waning moon; the prohibition of fish was connected with the myth of Osiris and Typhon.[2] Swine's flesh, with the exception of a single sacrificial repast, was interdicted, because the swine was an impure beast, as going to the boar generally when the moon is on the wane. They also abstained from salt and wine in times of fasting; and of flesh-meat they only eat very small birds. On the whole, the duties of a priest were so troublesome, that a Greek asserts it required more than ordinary strength to sustain them.[3]

The priests were circumcised in common with all Egyptians;[4] but in marriage they were limited to one wife, while polygamy was allowed in others.[5] The idea of physical purity, to which the service of the gods obliged, was carried much further among the Egyptians than any other people. The priests would not wear any other material on their persons than linen, byssus, or cotton; and they could only sleep on palm-leaves. Hence they only were admitted into the adytum or sanctuary of the temple building proper, where the images of the gods stood. The people entered the court only, and were prevented by a curtain or lattice from seeing what took place in the sanctuary; swine-herds were entirely ex-

[1] Herod. ii. 35; Porph. *Abst.* iv. 7. [2] Plut. *Isid.* c. 7.
[3] Porph. *l.c.* iv. 9. [4] Herod. ii. 37, 104; Diod. i. 28, 55. [5] Diod. i. 80.

cluded.[1] In general all strangers appeared impure to the Egyptians, for they did and ate so much that was offensive to them. Accordingly they never ate in the company of strangers. No Egyptian would have kissed a Greek, drunk out of the same cup with him, or used a knife that he had.

It struck the Greeks as one of the many peculiarities of the Egyptians, by which the inhabitants of the Nile country were distinguished from any other people, that before the time of the Lagidæ they had no priestesses. It is true there were Hierodouloi, young maidens who were sacred to Ammon, and before their marriage prostituted themselves to as many men as they chose; as Strabo, an eye-witness, informs us, with the addition of the extraordinary practice of mourning being made over every such Hierodule before her marriage.[2] We learn from Herodotus that a woman passed the night in the Ammon temple at Thebes as in the sanctuary of Bel at Babylon;[3] and he mentions besides, as a particular feature, that no impurity was practised in the Egyptian temples. The collegiate body of priests of the Nile consisted of eunuchs, probably because constant continence was required for that worship; voluntary continence could not have been calculated on.[4]

The testing and selection of the beasts to be sacrificed was a very laborious occupation. The animal was examined in the closest way, set upright, then laid on the back, and made to show his tongue. If but a single black hair were found on a beast, he was unclean for sacrifice. The sphragistæ, or sealers, were obliged to undertake this scrutiny according to the rules laid down in particular Hermetic writings. The seal with which the beasts of sacrifice were marked represented a man kneeling, who is fastened to a stake with his hands behind his back and a knife at his throat.[5] There is unmistakable evidence of the fact that the sacrifice of beasts took the place of the human one practised in older times; and Manetho[6] actually tells us of three men having been sacrificed to Hera (Sate), in times back, every day at

[1] Porph. *Abst.* iv. 6, 8. [2] Strabo, p. 816. [3] Herod. i. 181.
[4] Euseb. *Vita Const.* iv. 28; Greg. Naz. *Or.* iv. p. 128, *Carm.* lxi. in Nemes, vs. 277; cf. Eustath. p. 1183.
[5] Wilkinson, 2nd Ser. ii. 352. [6] *Ap. Porph. Abst.* ii. 55.

Heliopolis; but that King Amosis put an end to the custom by substituting images of wax (which were probably afterwards replaced by beasts); further, that in the town Ilithyia, Typhonic, *i.e.* red-haired men, used to be burnt to the goddess there, and their ashes thrown into the air.[1] This and the human sacrifice at the tomb of Osiris, mentioned by Diodorus, had now probably long come to an end; but Sextus speaks of one offered to Chronos (Sebek), as if it had been offered in his time.[2]

The annually repeated sacrifice of a bull in honour of Isis, described by Herodotus, was performed by the dismemberment of the animal, and stuffing the body with bread, honey, raisins, figs, and frankincense, and then burning it.[3] The severed pieces were consumed in the sacrificial banquet, the whole having a symbolic reference to the death and dismemberment of Osiris, as the generative power of nature, who in order to impart life goes through the process of dying and division. On this account, the body of the Osiris bull was filled with the noblest of natural productions, and the action also accompanied with gestures of sorrow, those who took part in it striking and wounding themselves. To the two deities, Osiris and Sais, once a year a swine was sacrificed, an animal otherwise contemplated with horror by an Egyptian, and never touched by him, far less ever tasted by him; but as it was then hallowed by being an oblation to the deity, and as the idea of communion required it should be actually eaten, a sacrificial meal was prepared of its flesh in this case. A third sacrifice, spoken of by Herodotus, shows the close connection conceived to exist between the deity and the sacred beast in correspondence with him. In Thebes, where at other times a ram could never be slaughtered, that animal was sacrificed once a year to the ram-headed Ammon on his festival; whereupon the fleece was stripped off the animal, and suspended to the statue of the god. Here, too, the partakers in the sacrifice inflicted blows on themselves, and then buried the ram in a sacred coffin.[4] The omission of the banquet, the sorrow, the burial, and the suspension of the fleece, all

[1] *Ap. Plut. Isid.* c. 73.
[2] Sext. Emp. *Pyrrh.* iii. 221, p. 173, Bekk.
[3] Herod. ii. 47.
[4] *Ibid.* ii. 42.

betray the fact of the ram being the hallowed instrument and vessel of the god himself. The more ordinary sacrifices, however, were not taken from the kinds of beasts which were honoured as sacred, but from the Typhonic; people also made an offering to the gods of the life of a creature that was odious to them; for example, that of a red ox. The beast had his head cut off, and that had the curse laid upon it. It might be that an evil threatening the sacrificer or the whole country was laid upon this head, which was either sold to a foreigner, or cast into the river.[1]

Besides sacrifices of beasts, the gods had regularly rich oblations of articles of food and incense made them. These presentations and acts of devotion were generally costly and various in the times of the old kings, and several of them individually endeavoured to surpass their predecessors in that respect. King Thotmes III. had it recorded in his annals that he presented his father Ra-Ammon with 878 door-keepers of both sexes (probably negro slaves), besides four cows for milk, which was daily set before the god at sunset in golden pails: he sums up the number of geese and loaves, besides incense, wine, and fruits, he had presented for the daily oblations, and tells us how he had given the god three cities, the yearly revenues of which were to cover the daily expense of the meats of sacrifice. The long lists of sacrificial gifts and presents further mentions linen stuff, gold, silver, whole fields, meadows, and ponds.[2] Undoubtedly the priests appropriated to themselves the repasts daily spread before the god. In inscriptions on their tombs it is frequently recorded that they had taken the cakes which had belonged to the table of their gods. But the king testifies his gifts were in addition to those already conveyed at an earlier period, and that the support of the temple was borne by the yearly revenues of the state. Such rich donations, however, were regarded as matters of exchange, with the fullest consciousness. Close by in the annals stands as tender of payment the assurance of the god that he would give the king new territories in recompense; and he on his part promises, in case of a happy return from a new expedition, that the gifts should be doubled.

[1] Herod. ii. 35. [2] Birch, *Archæol.* xxxv. 130–154.

On the whole, there was a gloomy, melancholy tone and manner of viewing things uppermost in the Egyptian religious system. It was observed as something peculiar, that even in their sacrifices they bemoaned the beast to be slaughtered, and struck themselves when it was dead.[1] The Egyptian gods, says Apuleius, rejoice in lamentation, the Greek in dances, the barbaric deities in the din of drums and fifes.[2] Another Greek said, they offer their gods tears and testimonials of honour in equal proportions.[3] In their domestic banquets a small model of a mummy was shown about, to remind the guests of the certainty of death and the uncertainty of life. Their only national song was the elegy of Maneros, in which the death of Osiris was lamented. Yet the Egyptian indemnified himself by the proud consciousness that he belonged to the cherished people, which alone was pure and worshipped the gods in the right way. The early kings, in their time, looked on all enemies as godless, and to "chastise the people" was a favourite expression with them.[4] The whole of Egypt was a holy land,[5] a picture of heaven, divided into thirty-six districts, corresponding to the thirty-six celestial stars, and as these stars in heaven were gods protecting and superintending the path of man on earth,[6] so each of these districts had his holy beast for its earthly guardian god. It was a sin for an Egyptian to forsake his country, and to betake himself among impure men, where strange gods were worshipped in corrupt fashion.[7] Thus there were no means of withdrawing from the yoke of religious obligations and abstinences; a yoke in no other civilised country pressing so grievously upon the individual. When the inhabitants of Marea and Apis, living in the province of Egypt bordering on Libya, were discontented with their burdensome religious system,[8] and craved for the forbidden meat, the flesh of the cow, they asked leave of the oracle of Ammon to be allowed to eat of everything, as they were not Egyptians really; and received a refusal in reply. One of the most onerous duties was

[1] Lucian, *de Sacrif.* c. 14.
[2] *De Deo Socr.* 685.
[3] Max. Tyr. *Diss.* viii. p. 85, ed. Markl.
[4] De Rougé, *Revue Archéol.* 1853, p. 680.
[5] Ἱερωτάτη χώρη, Porphyry terms it, *Abst.* ii. 5.
[6] Brugsch, *Zeitschr. d. D. Morg. Ges.* ix. 513.
[7] Porph. *Abst.* iv. 8.
[8] Ἀχθόμενοι τῇ περὶ τὰ ἱρὰ θρησκηίῃ, Herodotus says, ii. 18.

the care and worship of their animal gods in their own houses and families; for this business was not intrusted to the members of the household itself, but to the care of attendants of their own, male and female, who by certain tokens were recognisable at a distance, and to whom the greatest deference had to be shown.[1] If one of these beasts died, it was a misfortune for the whole family. On the other hand, the Egyptian felt himself fully recompensed in the pleasing delusion that he had the oracular guardian god of his family ever in the house and before his eyes, and had always the power of inquiring his will.

The sight of the Egyptian religious system made a peculiar impression on strangers. They came, for the most part, with great expectations to this wondrous land: Greeks, in particular, cherished high ideas of the wisdom of the priests, who were acquainted with all divine things, "and fathers of philosophical discipline,"[2] amongst whom Thales, Pythagoras, Pherecydes, Anaxagoras, Plato, and so many others, had sought and found instruction: and now they gazed on the magnificent processions, in which the priests masked themselves in order to represent their beast-headed gods;[3] they saw the water excursions, made to the idols: they found people worshipping the *crepitus ventris*, as a deity, at Pelusium,[4] and a living man invoked in Anabis.[5] They beheld splendid temples, surrounded by courts, and arcades of pillars, and sacred precincts, and in them no other object of adoration than an ox, a he-goat, or a crocodile: if they obtained admission to partake in the mysteries there, they discovered nothing involved in them but that Isis sought the phallus of Osiris, and found it.[6] The entire system of beast-worship appeared an absurdity to them; but there was a contagious influence in the thing: it was as if with the air of the country they inhaled the dominant delusions: and the mockers, after a time, were often converted into believing worshippers. "Strangers coming for the first time

[1] Diod. i. 84. [2] Macrob. *Sat.* i. 14. 3; *In Somn. Scip.* i. 19. 2.

[3] Apul. *Metam.* p. 775; Herod. ii. 122.

[4] Orig. *adv. Cels.* v. 5; Hieron. *Comm. in Esai.* xiii. 14: cf. "Diss. sur le Dieu Pet divinisé par les Egyptiens," in the *Mémoires de Litt. et d'Hist. par* Des Molets, i. 48.

[5] Porphyr. *ap. Eus. Præp. Evg.* pp. 94, 117 (lib. iii. 41. 12).

[6] Hippolyt. *Philos.* p. 101.

into Egypt," Philo said, "know not what to do for laughter at the divine beasts, until the universal superstition has overpowered them also."[1] A Greek comic poet is highly amusing when he makes his warrior speak his mind about the repulsive nature of the Egyptian religious customs. "I can't," he represents him saying, "be your comrade, for our fashions and laws are so very different. You pray to your ox, I sacrifice mine to the gods. The eel is a mighty god in your eyes, with us he is but the best of dainties. You eat no swine's flesh, but I have a special liking for the whole animal. The dog you invoke, and I thrash him when I catch him eating the roast. The law with us is, the priest must have an unblemished person; with you, it is, he must be circumcised. When you see a sick cat, you whine, but I lustily cudgel the life out of her, and then skin her. You make a potentate of the shrew-mouse, while we hold him to be a nothing."[2]

Apollonius of Tyana, the renowned Neo-Pythagorean, censured the religion of Egypt in a more serious tone. "Whatever could have induced the Egyptians to present their gods to men in such strange and ridiculous figures, with rare exceptions? But very few are clothed in a wise and godlike form; in the rest of the temples, the worship of senseless and contemptible beasts openly prevails, rather than that of the gods; and they seem there to prefer ridiculing the divine being to the adoring of him. People have no appeal, in this matter, to Egyptian wisdom, on the score of the gods appearing all the more venerable because of their symbolic and allegorical representation under the forms of beasts; for what can there be worthy of veneration in a hawk, an ibis, or a he-goat? The Egyptians deprive their gods of the power of appearing beautiful, and of being conceived as such."[3]

The Egyptian priests, whom the thoughtful Theophrastus[4] himself called the cleverest of people, unquestionably had what the Greeks had not, an old traditional

[1] Πρὶν τὸν ἐγχώριον τῦφον ταῖς διανοίαις εἰσοικίσασθαι. Philo. *de Decem Orac.*, *Opp.* ed. Mangus, ii. 194.

[2] Anaxandrid. *ap. Meineke, Fragm. Com. Græc.* III, 181.

[3] Philostr. *Vita Apoll.* vi. 19: *a disciplina arcani.*

[4] *Ap. Porph. Abst.* ii. 5.

theology. It formed the contents of the first ten of their forty-two holy books; but their doctrine was esoteric. "Mysterious, and but little communicative," said Strabo, "it was only after a time, and being treated with studied courtesy, they could be wheedled into imparting one or two of their (astronomical) theorems; but they kept back the greater part;"[1] and this leads him to the observation, that the full Egyptian year long remained unknown to the Greeks. Still less was any communication of their peculiar theological tenets to be expected from them by a stranger; for whosoever did not submit himself to circumcision could learn nothing of them, nor have a single lesson in the sacerdotal writing of hieroglyphics;[2] and there is only one Greek, Pythagoras, of whom we are told that he underwent the operation in order to obtain access to their secret lore.[3] Under the Lagidæ and Romans, however, this system of secrecy could no longer be so strictly maintained; and after the priest Manetho (about 250 B.C.) had composed a treatise on several of the Egyptian deities, besides his chronological works, Chæremon, a sacred scribe in the time of the first Roman emperors, and who professed the Stoic philosophy, wrote a work about hieroglyphics and the history and religion of his native land. Two centuries later, at the time of the downfall of heathenism, the Neo-Platonist Jamblichus, or another contemporary of the same school, composed his work upon the mysteries of Egypt; yet Hecatæus of Abdera, about the time of the first Ptolemy, with the aid of the writings of Manetho, had already published a work on the philosophy of the Egyptians.

But it follows that these authorities give a contradictory account of the contents of the Egyptian theology, and are divided into two classes, the one materialist, the other pneumatist or idealist. This drives one to the conclusion that the Egyptian tradition admitted of either view, *i.e.* that, as regarded the spiritual nature of the deity, it offered no distinct doctrine above that of the worship of the sun. Hecatæus, Manetho, and Chæremon agreed in this, that the Egyptian creed was acquainted with no primal spiritual

[1] Strabo, xvii. 806. [2] Orig. *Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.*, *Opp.* iv. 495.
[3] Porphyr. *Vita Pyth.*; Theodoret. *Therap.* i. 467.

element, but only a primal Hyle, out of which the four elements disentangled themselves, and living creatures were formed. Isis and Osiris were sun and moon: other gods than the heavenly bodies there were none; yet Zeus-Ammon was the all-penetrating pneuma, the world-soul in a material sense. Porphyry, quoting Chæremon, says they explained the sun to be Demiurgos, or creator; and interpreted the sagas of Osiris and Isis, and all hieratic myths, partly of the stars, their risings and courses, and partly of the waxing and waning of the moon, or the course of the sun, or the Nile, but nothing of incorporeal living creatures.[1] Hence, too, the generality of them believed in a necessity, or "fate," dependent upon the motions of the stars, to which human things were subject, and, in temples and images, worshipped only such beings as were in a position to relax the laws of this fate.

The author of the work upon the Egyptian mysteries,—if not Jamblichus, still a contemporary of the same school,—confesses on his side there is no unity to be found in the teaching of the Egyptian priests, neither in their ancient ones nor among those living at the time;[2] and therefore his theory embraces the doctrine of a single school only. Chæremon, he says, and the rest, who have only taken up with first cosmical principles,[3] merely enumerate the lowest class of principles: what was said to the people was chiefly about the visible and corporeal universe, they being incapable of rising to ideas of the intellectual world; but the priests in reality taught, as he maintains, above this visible world, a first and highest being, simple, indivisible, and immovable; a monad who knew himself, was self-sufficient, and was only to be invoked in silence. This monad was the archetype of the second god, who is unity proceeding from unity, the first essence; and this second god, Kneph, is his own father, for he proceeded, by spontaneous motion, from the immeasurable womb of the primal being, sole and self-contained. First under him is the god, the demiurge, the generating Ammon, who, as the artistic statuary, is called Phthah, as the beneficent, or author of pleasant sensations, Osiris, besides many other

[1] Porphyr. *ap. Euseb. Pr. Ev.* iii. 4, p. 92; cf. p. 118.
[2] Jambl. viii. 1, p. 157. [3] *Ibid.* viii. 4, p. 160.

titles, according to his operations.[1] The materialists confounded the world-soul with the sun; while to the idealists, on the contrary, the sun was only the most mighty of beings, but formed by the demiurge out of matter, and serving him, and having for his portion the hegemony of all the elements and their powers.

The Egyptian priests were accustomed not only to threaten the sacred beasts, but the other gods also; and Porphyry gives us from the volume of Chæremon specimens of such ways of terrifying; as threats that the heaven should be shaken, or the mysteries of Isis betrayed, or the secrets of Abydos (one of the burial-places of Osiris) revealed; that the ship of the sun should be stopped in its course,[2] or the limbs of Osiris thrown to the Typhon.[3] The advocate of the Egyptians replied, that the things which the priests threatened were certainly calculated to create alarm, for the maintenance of the world's peace depended upon the close observance of the Isis mysteries, and secrecy in regard to what was hidden at Abydos; the unveiling of the unutterable essence of the gods would endanger the well-being of the universe; but that the Egyptian priests, differing in this respect from the Chaldean, employed such threats because, blending the divine and the demonic, they intended to frighten the intermediate beings or demons belonging to the earth, and make them subserve their will. This, indeed, was a Neo-Platonic notion, which Jamblichus attributed to the Egyptians: the sacerdotal doctrine knew nothing of such intermediate beings.

The champion of the Egyptian religion excuses even the phallus worship, and the obscene language used in the Osiris festival. The procession of the phallus, he says, had a symbolic meaning in regard of the generative nature-power awakened in spring. The disgusting talk was a symbol of the naked, foul matter that had first to be fashioned and dressed. Besides, this excitement of physical instincts was good as a safety-valve, a certain degree of escape being allowed a man, that he might be quieter

[1] Jamblich. viii. 3, p. 150.

[2] *τὴν Βάριν στήσει.* The rejoinder of Jamblichus shows that this is spoken of the mythical boat of the sun. Jam. vi. 7, p. 149.

[3] Porph. *Ep. ad Aneb.*

afterwards.[1] So much at least one gathers from these exculpations, that the Egyptian priests of that time had never anything better to offer in favour of their usages, and that the author of the book, with all his Neo-Platonic colouring of some points, is the representative of some one of the sacerdotal schools, at least in its essential views and traditions, as may further be concluded from the harmony existing between the ideas of his book and those of the Hermetic document entitled Asclepios, which must be considerably older than that of Jamblichus, as Lactantius had already made use of it.

Meanwhile the materialist view of the Egyptian doctrines still seems to have had its partisans, for even the late writer Damascius (in the sixth century) again asserts that the Egyptians of philosophical education in his time had brought to light, out of the Egyptian traditions, a fact long concealed, that, according to their teaching, the darkness (*i.e.* the chaotic Hyle), impenetrable by reason, was the first principle of all things.[2]

5. THE FATE AND COURSE OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE EGYPTIAN RELIGION

The tenacious obduracy, and, it may almost be called, rigid immovability, of the Egyptian religious system has been deservedly brought into prominence. It was grounded as much in the character of the people as in the organisation of the priesthood; but had more of these characteristics in the later times, from the period of the Persian dominion, than in the older ones. By the invasion and domination of the Hyksos, a warlike shepherd people who had migrated from Arabia, the worship of the god Seti, or Typhon, and probably of Nephthys also, was either introduced into Egypt or exalted to a kind of supremacy; and the expulsion of the stranger conquerors, after the lapse of five hundred years, was followed by the god, hitherto worshipped as a powerful protector, being turned into an evil and detestable being. Manifold traces of religious struggles are discoverable in the oldest history of the land.

[1] Jambl. i. 11, pp. 21, 22. [2] Damasc. in *Wolfii Anecd. Gr.* iii. 260.

The kings Cheops and Chephren had the temples shut for thirty years; and the impiety of the Egyptian kings, according to Diodorus, gave occasion to many rebellions. The most remarkable of these was the reaction against polytheism, and particularly the Ammon worship, which began with a king of the eighteenth dynasty, Amenophis XIV., about 1430 B.C. This monarch intended to reduce the entire Egyptian system of worship to the invocation of only one god, the sun-god Ra, and to tolerate no other representation of him than the simple sun-disk with rays. Everywhere he had the names and statues of Ammon, and the goddesses Mut and Neben (Suben?), and of the other gods as well, destroyed, in the temples, and even in the tombs. After his death, however, what he had introduced was destroyed, and what he had destroyed was set up again. Not only all his temples and palaces, but the very sculptured work representing him and his sun-disk, in the rock-tombs and on the mountain sides, was erased.[1]

It was not merely Seti and Nephthys, but other new gods who were brought into Egypt from foreign parts. From and after the conquering expeditions under the eighteenth dynasty, Baal and Astarte, the Phœnician god Renpu or Reseph, the Moabite goddess Ken, and the Assyro-Persian Anata or Anaitis, here too called Satesch, are to be met with in the Nile country.[2] The last-named goddess is styled "Lady of the heavens, mistress of the gods, ruler of both worlds, and eldest daughter of the sun"; and she was invoked that she would discover her beauties to her suppliant in the lower world.[3] She was also delineated as a bitch-dog tearing her enemies, with the inscription, "Anata in victory."[4]

The Persian domination was not so hostile and destructive to the Egyptian religion as might have been expected from the strong opposition otherwise shown by the servants of Ormuzd to such kind of god and beast cultus. Cambyses, it is true, plundered the temples and

[1] Lepsius, *Götterkreis*, pp. 200 sqq.; Vaux, *Handbook*, pp. 338, 339.

[2] Birch, "Observations, etc.," in the *Transactions of the R. S. of Lit.*, series ii. vol. iii. pp. 161, 162.

[3] De Rougé in *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscr.* xx. 176–182.

[4] Orcurti, ii. 40.

sepulchres at Thebes, had the priests scourged, and wounded Apis mortally; but, on the other hand, he prayed to the goddess Neith at Sais, was initiated in their mysteries, and restored all their rights to the priests and their temples. He behaved in the same way at Memphis, and actually paid divine honours to Apis after he had killed him in a fit of madness.[1] Darius, too, conducted himself as a protector of the local cultus. On the other hand, under Darius Nothus, about the year 420 B.C., a remarkable attempt was made to approximate and subordinate the Egyptian religion to the Persian. The Mede Ostanes, appointed by the king to the presidency of the Egyptian sanctuaries, took his seat in the temple at Memphis, and employed for his objects foreigners, Democritus of Abdera (who, after being educated by the Persians, adopted their religion), a learned Jewess Maria, and Pammenes. These it seems, had for their share to support by their writings the intended religious reformation, in which the introduction of the Persian fire-worship was probably meditated in conjunction with that of the god Phthah.[2]

The plan failed, however, for Egypt shortly afterwards tore itself away from the Persian yoke, and remained independent fifty years (400–349 B.C.). During this period, Mendes, a city to which belonged Nepheritos,[3] the founder of the new dynasty, rose to the importance of an Egyptian capital. The result of this was the old story, that the local god of Mendes, Mandu, also obtained a higher rank amongst the gods of the land. As sun-god, Mandu-Ra was, by force probably, sculptured with his hawk's head upon many of the monuments of the country at that time, and deposed even Ammon-Ra at Thebes; but when Mendes sank again to a city of the second class, the god Mandu had also to retire.[4]

With the reconquest of Egypt by the Persian king Artaxerxes Ochus, the attacks on the religion of the soil were also renewed. The victors plundered and destroyed temples, set up before the eyes of the Egyptians the ass, the beast they abominated, for their patron god, commanded

[1] Maury, "Découvertes sur l'Egypte," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1855, ii. 1069.
[2] Syncelli *Chronograph.* i. 471, ed. Bonn.
[3] Diod. xiv. 35.
[4] Sharpe, *Hist. of Egypt*, 3rd ed. i. 152.

them to pray to it, and slaughtered the holy Apis as a sacrifice to the new god.[1] Very different was the conduct of the Grecian conqueror. Shortly afterwards, Alexander, entering Memphis, went to the temple of Apis in great state, sacrificed to the sacred bull, as their native kings had done on their coronation, and then undertook the expedition to the Oasis of Ammon in Libya. Every Egyptian king had styled himself son of the sun; and it was Alexander's will to hear from the renowned oracle of Ammon-Ra, or, in reality, Cneph-Ra, that he too was son of the sun-god Ammon-Ra. His wish was gratified.

The Greek rule, which spread over the whole Nile country on the Lagidæ mounting the throne and along with the rise of Alexandria, was easier for the people to bear than the Persian, for the Greeks did not only spare their gods, but worshipped them. Still, as life and art in Egypt shows itself in the earliest times at an advanced stage, and has gained little or nothing at a later, so contact with the Greeks, never carried to the degree of national intercourse or fusion, produced no essential change or development in the social and religious circumstances of the people. The first of the new kings, Ptolemy Soter, spent the sum of fifty talents on the burial of Apis deceased. The inner sanctuary of the great temples at Karnak, destroyed by the Persians in their religious hatred, was rebuilt. A new god, or an old one in a new dress, Serapis, was found at the proper time to embody Hellenic-Egyptian syncretism. To the Egyptians this Osorapis, or "the dead," was Apis identified with Osiris, or the Sun. Ramses the Great and his son had already introduced the cultus of this Osiris or Apis, represented with a bull's head. Since the times of Psammetichus, the Egyptian priests had probably represented this god to the Greeks as being identical with their Dionysos of the lower world; so that many of them believed their Dionysos to be of Egyptian descent, and their homage to the genuine Egyptian Dionysos, namely, Apis-Osiris, to be immortalised in a serapeum built on purpose for themselves, and which was attached to the Serapeum proper, that of Apis, accessible only to the children of the soil.[2] Next, Ptolemy had

[1] Ælian. *H. A.* x. 28. [2] *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1855, ii. 1073.

brought to him at Alexandria from Sinope the colossal statue of the Zeus Sinopeus there, in consequence of a pretended dream or vision vouchsafed to him. This Zeus was an Asiatic sun-god coinciding with Pluto; and two Egyptian scholars, Timotheus and Manetho, recognised him, by his attributes of Cerberus and the dragon, to be the Egyptian Serapis.[1] To the Greeks now the new god was Pluto; and Dionysos to the Egyptians would be Osiris; but at the same time, in a general sense, a god of the first class, and therefore identical with Ra. Hence, in the Greek inscriptions, he sometimes bears the names of "Zeus, the great sun." In time, then, his worship too became so generally diffused through the country, that a later Greek counted forty-two sanctuaries of his; and gradually Osiris was set aside by him, even in Memphis,[2] though he certainly seems not to have gone off without compulsion and violence.[3] The success, however, was so complete, that in the papyrus rolls of Memphis, of Philometor's time (180–145 B.C.), the name of Osiris had already disappeared; he does, indeed, show afterwards, but seldom, and only in non-Egyptian Greek or Latin inscriptions.

The invocation of deified kings now tacked itself on to the cultus of the traditional deities of the land. Not that it was a new custom first introduced by the Lagidæ; on the contrary, there had been many instances of apotheosis, in the very early times, of the old Pharaohs. Apart from the fact of the kings of the first two dynasties having become mythological personages and received divine honours, Amenophis I. (as nearly as 1550 B.C.), with his wife, had a worship which is borne witness to on many monuments; and there was lately found a priest of this deified king, by name Piahesi, who, on his sepulchral monument, addresses his prayers to both deities, the king and his wife.[4] Amenophis III. (about 1430) erected a temple, still in existence, to his own genius, literally to his image living on earth. Raneb-ma,[5] and the great Ramses Sesostris, appears in the temples he built as contemplar deity with Phthah and Ammon, indeed is represented there

[1] Tac. *Hist.* iv. 83; Plut. *Is. et Osir.* xxviii.
[2] Letronne, *Recueil*, i. 155.
[3] Macrob. *Sat.* i. 7.
[4] Orcurti, i. 71.
[5] Lepsius, *Brief aus Æg.* 256, 415.

as praying to himself, and he bears the title, "Ruler of the gods."[1] This custom of distinguishing between their own earthly person and a celestial genius besides, and of offering sacrifices to the latter, seems in every instance to have been peculiar to the kings. Even the custom of paying divine honour to their ancestors, who had sat on the throne, never extended beyond a single potentate, generally of the same dynasty. Thus the cultus of King Amenatep, the name of whose priest, Tianum, still remains on the monuments, did not go beyond the sovereigns of the eighteenth dynasty; the later kings, as no longer allied by blood, allowed the worship to die out.[2]

The Lagidæ provided better than the Pharaohs for the permanence of the worship of their predecessors. The reigning king, as well as all his ancestors, now shared their temples and altars with the gods of the land; their statues were set up in the temples. Their chapels received the principal distinctions, and were erected even in private dwelling-houses, and people prayed to them there in conjunction with Isis, and Osiris or Serapis.[3] There were now priests of the gods Soter, of the gods Adelphi, of the gods Euergetæ, of the gods Philopator, etc., not only in Alexandria and Ptolemais, but in Thebes and Memphis; and as soon as one Lagides succeeded his father on the throne, were he of age or but a minor, he was created a god forthwith, and the high-priest at Alexandria was charged with his worship. This personage united the functions of a priest of the Ptolemies and a director of the Alexandrine Museum with an inspection over all the sacerdotal colleges in the country;[4] so that through him the sovereigns had the whole Egyptian religious system under their control. Deputations from all these colleges had to proceed every year to Alexandria, as a practical recognition of their relations of dependence. The regulation worked so well that it was kept afoot even by the Roman emperors. But that priest and people should have so freely and cheerfully conceded entrance into their temples to these new gods—these vicious and blood-stained tyrants, for such the Lagidæ,

[1] Lepsius, 113; cf. the same author's treatise, *Ueber einige Ergebnisse der Aeg. Denkmäler*, etc. 1853, p. 6.

[2] Orcurti, ii. 128. [3] Letronne, *Recueil*, i. 363. [4] *Ibid.* i. 360.

for the most part, were—is a proof how deeply fallen that priesthood then was. Content and happy to have free allowance to worship their old country's gods after the hereditary fashion, the Egyptians made no scruple about giving places of honour in their pantheon by the side of their godlike oxen, goats, and cats, whether to their dead or living masters, strangers and impure as they ever continued to be in their estimation.

VI. Carthage

Carthage was in ruins from after the year 146 B.C.; but the Carthaginian worship of the gods, a branch of the Phœnician religion, kept its ground as well as the Punic language, which was spoken for centuries in the country, though the Latin tongue had the advantage of it in the cities with Roman inhabitants. The Italian colonists and their descendants made an easy matter of granting good terms to the Punic deities and their rites. Baal or Moloch was Saturn to them, and Astarte, or Cœlestis, as she was called in Africa, was metamorphosed into Juno. The old Carthaginians had, as a colony, sent tithes and a portion of their plunder in war to Melkarth in Tyre. At home they had sedulously offered the sacrifice of human life, and specially of children, in times of necessity and danger, in fulfilment of vows or in gratitude for victories won. Yet parents there, in lieu of presenting their best children to the gods for sacrifice, had often substituted others, whom they had bought and educated by stealth. At the time Carthage was besieged by Agathocles, an examination was made, and the result was that some of the consecrated children were found to be substitutes; whereupon, to repair the offence, two hundred of the noblest children were selected and publicly sacrificed to Moloch, not less than three hundred other fathers having of their own accord offered their own offspring.[1] This rite of sacrificing children lasted, even during the Roman dominion, among the Punic inhabitants of the country; so that, according to Tertullian,[2] children were sacrificed quite publicly to Saturn (Baal),

[1] Diod. xx. 14; Lact. *Inst.* i. 21, 33.

[2] *Apol.* p. 9.

until the proconsul Tiberius, in the second century after Christ, had the priests who did so crucified on the very trees which overshadowed the temples of that abomination. The worship of Astarte, too, was transplanted into Roman Carthage; and the Christian writers still mention the fervent homage paid to "the celestial maiden" and her magnificent temple. People had copies made of the Carthaginian, as well as of the Ephesian, goddess; and, even in later times, a philosopher, Asclepiades, is spoken of as always wearing a little silver image of the goddess Cœlestis on his person.[1] As to the impurity of the rite of this goddess, and the indecencies with which the games set up in her honour were always celebrated, strong expressions are to be found in Christian authors: Augustine calls Cœlestis a Vesta of prostitutes.[2]

[1] Amm. Marc. xxii. 13.
[2] *Civ. Dei*, iv. 10, and ii. 3; Salvian, *de Gub. Dei*, vii. 16.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED
Edinburgh

"EDITIONS TO HAVE"

are uniformly published in fcap. 8vo at 2s. 6d. per Volume, cloth extra, top edge gilt.

Museum Editions are smaller (18mo), and are published at 1s. 6d. per Volume, in cloth, top edge gilt; or limp leather, top edge gilt, at 2s.; or stamped leather, gilt edges, 2s. 6d.

All prices are strictly net, that is, the books are supplied to the Booksellers on such terms as preclude their giving any discount whatever.

Any Bookseller will be pleased to obtain for you any book herein should it not be in stock at the moment.

Gibbings & Company,
18 Bury Street, London, W.C.

ARABIAN NIGHTS.

THE THOUSAND AND ONE NIGHTS. Translated by Edward William Lane. With an Introduction by Joseph Jacobs, and 36 Illustrations by Frank Brangwyn, A.R.A. Six Volumes, fcap. 8vo, cloth extra, top edge gilt, 15s. net.

It should be noted that this Edition is not that usually known as "Lane's," but is printed from that issued by Murray, with the ordinary spelling of the best-known names; it is the pleasanter reading on that account. The Editor's Introduction is learned and interesting. The Illustrations contain some of the Artist's most characteristic figure drawing, the binding design, title-page, and head pieces are all designed by him.

CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL UNION
BL96.D67131906 C001 V001
THE GENTILE AND THE JEW IN THE COURTS OF

3 0311 00006 7863

29735

WITHDRAWN

BL 96 .D6713 1906 v. 1

D¨ollinger, Johann Joseph
Ignaz von, 1799-1890.

The Gentile and the Jew in
the courts of the Temple of

BL 96 .D6713 1906 v. 1

D¨ollinger, Johann Joseph
Ignaz von, 1799-1890.

The Gentile and the Jew in
the courts of the Temple of

PLEASE see that this book is returned on time: others may be waiting for it.

KINDLY refrain from defacing this book in any way, and also from leaving markers of any kind between the pages.

3 0851 00006 7863